Boston Public Library
3 9999 10522 714 2

PER. RM /c.
No. AP2.N7
V.156
1893

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

VOL. CLVI.

L.N.

THE

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

RE-ESTABLISHED BY ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

1901. 1. 156

EDITED BY LLOYD BRYCE.

9

VOL. CLVI.

Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

PUBLICATION OFFICE

NEW YORK:
No. 3 EAST FOURTEENTH STREET.
1893.

6269/4

NOV 10 1964

19.

Per. Dept.
*AP2
.N7
vol. 156

L. 16.
Oct. 19, 1893.

Copyright, 1893, by LLOYD BRYCE.

All rights reserved.

PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

INDEX

TO THE

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIXTH VOLUME.

OF THE

North American Review.

Abuse of Secrecy, The, 505.
ADAM, MADAME. Criminal Law in France, 160; Recollections of George Sand, 293.
ADAMS, ROBERT, Jr. Faults in Our Consular Service, 461.
After Death—What? 467.
Agnosticism, Immortality and, 567.
A Look Ahead, 685.
Amélie Rives, A Reply to, 377.
America, Two Englishwomen on, 449.
American Common Schools, The, 254.
American Farming a Hundred Years Hence, 257.
AMMEN, DANIEL. Recollections of the Panama Canal Congress, 136.
Ancient and Modern Dentistry, 631.
ANDREWS, CLARENCE. Persia at the World's Fair, 611.
Ann Arbor Strike, The, 561.
Annexation, The Advantages of, 265.
Army, Needed Reforms in the, 212.
ARNOLD, E. F. Inebriety from a Medical Standpoint, 759.
Art of Living Two Hundred Years, The, 755.
Art of Mystery in Fiction, 432.

BARR, AMELIA E. Flirting Wives, 69; Good and Bad Mothers, 408.
BECKER, G. F. The Interior of the Earth, 439.
Behring Sea Case, The, 513.
Bible Lesson for Mr. Herbert Spencer, A, 87.
BILES, J. H. Thirty Knots an Hour to Europe, 717.
BLAND, R. P. In the Interest of Shylock, 171; The Currency and the Democratic Party, 485.
BONFIELD, JOHN. Police Protection at the World's Fair, 713.
Boons and Banes of Free Coinage, 171.
BOURN, AUGUSTUS O. Italy at the World's Fair, 43.
Brahman, The Migrations of the, 379.
Brain Surgery, 390.
British Section at the World's Fair, The, 237.
Brussels' Conference Reviewed, The, 493.
BRYCE, JAMES. Political Organizations in the United States and England, 105.
BUNNELL, NEWTON L. A Farmer's View of Free Coinage, 754.
BURDETT, S. S. How Shall the Pension List Be Revised? 420.
BURROUGHS, JOHN. The Decadence of Theology, 576.
By Women for Women, 501.

Campaigning in the West, 126.
Canada at the World's Fair, 613.
Canadian Question, The, 382.
CARNEGIE, ANDREW. A Look Ahead, 685.
CHANDLER, W. E. Shall Immigration Be Suspended? 1.
Changes in the Church of England, 149.
Charges at the World's Fair, 385.
Christ as an Orator, 750.
Church of England, Changes in the, 149.
CHURCH, W. C. How Shall the Pension List Be Revised? 425.
CLARK, ALVAN G. Possibilities of the Telescope, 48.
Clearing House, National Banking and the, 365.
COAN, T. M. Migrations of the Brahman, 379.
COCKRAN, W. B. The Financial Outlook, 739.
COLEMAN, LEIGHTON. The Limits of Legitimate Religious Discussion, 9.
Conceptions of a Future Life, 323.
Consular Service, Faults in Our, 461.
COOPER, W. B. Is Land Held Out of Use? 638.
Coöperation, Industrial, 61.
COUDERT, F. R. Shall Our Laws Be Codified? 264.
Criminal Law in France, 160.
CROFFUT, W. T. Do the Fittest Survive? 502.
Currency and the Democratic Party, The, 485.
CURTIS, G. T. Is It Constitutional? 262.

DAVIDSON, CLARA D. The Abuse of Secrecy, 505.
DAVIES, T. H. The Hawaiian Situation, 605.
DAVIS, GEORGE R. Charges at the World's Fair, 385.
Death as a Factor in Progress, 634.
Decadence of Theology, The, 576.

Dentistry Ancient and Modern, 631
Democratic Party, The Currency and the, 485.
Depositor's Point of View, A, 181.
DICKENS, CHARLES. Disappearing Dickensland, 670.
Dickensland, Disappearing, 670.
Disadvantages of the Level-Premium System, 599.
Disappearing Dickensland, 670.
Discussion, The Limits of Legitimate Religious, 9.
DOLE, C. F. After Death—What ? 467.
DOREMUS, R. OGDEN. Thoughts Suggested by Prof. Dewar's Discoveries, 543.
Do the Fittest Survive ? 502.
Drink Traffic, Possible Reformation of the, 586 ; Reform of the, 728.

Earth, The Interior of the, 439.
Earthquakes, High Buildings and, 338.
EDSON, CYRUS. Fads of Medical Men, 286.
England in the Orient, 359.
English Poor Law Reform, 508.
ENLOE, B. A. Further Views of Pension List Revision, 626.
Europe at the World's Fair, 237.
Europe, Thirty Knots an Hour to, 717.

Fads of Medical Men, 286.
Farm and Home Proprietorship, 119.
Farmer's Point of View, Free Coinage from a, 717.
Farming, American, a Hundred Years Hence, 257.
FARRAR, F. W. Conceptions of a Future Life, 323.
Faults in Our Consular Service, 461.
FENN, G. M. Art of Mystery in Fiction, 432.
Fiction, Art of Mystery in, 432.
FIELD, DAVID DUDLEY. Industrial Coöperation, 61.
Financial Outlook, The, 739.
Financial Situation, The, 485.
Flirting Wives, 69.
Foreign Nations at the World's Fair, 34, 237, 332.
FOSTER, CHARLES. The Brussels Conference Reviewed, 493.
FOULKE, W. D. Campaigning in the West, 126.
France, Criminal Law in, 160.
France, Middle Class Life in, 478.
France, Universal Suffrage in, 27.
Free Coinage, Boons and Banes of, 171.
Free Coinage, A Farmer's View of, 754.
French Section at World's Fair, The, 241.
From Renan's Point of View, 251.
Further Views of Pension List Revision, 418.
Future Life, Conceptions of a, 323.

Gates Ajar—Twenty-five Years After, The, 567.
GIBBON, JOHN. Needed Reforms in the Army, 212.
Government Aid to the Nicaragua Canal, 195.
GREENE, J. L. Modern Insurance and Its Possibilities, 309.
GREGORY, ROBERT. Changes in the Church of England, 149.
GREY-EGERTON, LADY. Two English Women on America, 449.

HAMILTON, GAIL. A Bible Lesson for Mr. Herbert Spencer, 87.
HAMMOND, W. H. Insomnia and Recent Hypnotics, 18 ; Brain Surgery, 390.
HARPER, E. B. The Disadvantages of the Level-Premium System, 593.
HANSBOROUGH, H. C. Why Immigration Should Not Be Suspended, 220.
Hawaiian Situation, The, 605.
HEPBURN, A. B. National Banking and the Clearing House, 365.
HERBERT, HILARY A. The Lesson of the Naval Review, 641.
HICHBORN, PHILIP. Shipbuilding Here and Abroad, 398.
High Buildings and Earthquakes, 338.
High Caste Indian Magic, 75.
HOLMES, GEO. K. Farm and Home Proprietorship, 119.
HOMANS, SHEPPARD. Modern Insurance and Its Possibilities, 313.
Home, The Hope of a, 228.
Hope of a Home, The, 228.
How Shall the Pension List Be Revised, 416
How to Check Testamentary Litigation, 661.
How to Revise the Tariff, 129.
HUBBARD, JAMES M. Students as Showmen, 123.
HUTCHINSON, WOODS. Death as a Factor in Progress, 634.
HYDE, T. ALEXANDER. Christ as an Orator, 750.

Immigration, Shall It Be Suspended ? 1.
Immigration, Why It Should Not Be Suspended, 220.
Immortality and Agnosticism, 567.
Industrial Coöperation, 61.
Inebriety from a Medical Standpoint, 759.
Insomnia and Recent Hypnotics, 18.
Insurance, and Its Possibilities, Modern, 303.
Interior of the Earth, The, 439.
In the Interest of Shylock, 171.
IRWIN, J. N. Claims to Statehood, 354.
Is It Constitutional ? 282.
Is Land Held Out of Use ? 638.
Italy at World's Fair, 43.

JACKSON, EDWARD P. An Uncut Diamond, 122; Sing Po's Chart, 639.
Japan at the World's Fair, 34.

KELLAR, H. High Case Indian Magi 75.
KIMBALL, A. R. From Renan's Point of View, 251.
KING, JAS. M. The American Common Schools, 254.
KINNEAR, WILLIAM. The Art of Living Two Hundred Years, 755.

Labor Organizations in Law, 65.
Labor Problem, Solutions of the, 61.
Law, Labor Organizations in, 65.
Lesson of the Naval Review, The, 641.
Life Insurance, Which Is the Best Form of ? 594.
Limits of Legitimate Religious Discussion, The, 9.
LITCHFIELD, G. A. The Natural-Premium System, 594.
LOME, E. DUPUY DE. Spain at the World's Fair, 332.
LOWRY, ROBT. The Negro as a Mechanic, 472.

M CLAUGHRY, R. W Police Protection at the World's Fair, 711.
MCCURDY, R. A. Modern Insurance and Its Possibilities, 303.
MACÉ, JEAN. Universal Suffrage in France, 27.
Magic, High Caste Indian, 75.
MALLOCK, W. H. Who Are the Greatest Wealth Producers? 648.
MALMESBURY, COUNTESS OF. Wild Stag Hunting in Devon and Somerset, 186.
Mechanic, The Negro as a, 472.
Medical Men, Fads of, 285.
MERCUR, LILLIAN A. By Women for Women, 501.
Migrations of the Brahman, The, 379.
Middle Class Life in France, 478.
Mistakes—But Not of Moses, 247.
Modern Insurance and Its Possibilities, 303.
MORGAN, JOHN T. Government Aid to the Nicaragua Canal, 195.

National Banking and the Clearing House, 365.
Natural-Premium System, The, 594.
Naval Review, The Lesson of the, 641.
Needed Reforms in the Army, 212.
Negro as a Mechanic, The, 472.
Nicaragua Canal, Government Aid to the, 195.

O'NEIL, J. H. Further Views of Pension List Revision, 621.
Orator, Christ as an, 750.
Orient, England in the, 359.
Our City Vigilance League, 98.
Outlook, The Financial, 739.

Panama Canal Congress, Recollections of the, 136.
PARKHURST, C. H. Our City Vigilance League, 98.
Pension List, How Shall It Be Revised? 416.
Pension List Revision, Further Views of, 618.
Persia at the World's Fair, 611.
PHELPS, ELIZABETH STUART. The Gates Ajar—Twenty-five Years After, 567.
PIMENOFF, L. L. Science and the Woman's Question, 248.
Police Protection at the World's Fair, 711.
Political Organizations in the United States and Great Britain, 105.
Politics, A Railway Party in, 552.
Poor Law Reform, English, 508.
PORRITT, EDWARD. English Poor Law Reform, 508.
Possibilities of the Telescope, 48.
Possible Reformation of the Drink Traffic, 586.
PRINCE, L. BRADFORD. Claims to Statehood, 346.
Progress, Death as a Factor in, 634.

Railway Party in Politics, A, 552.
RAINSFORD, W. D. Possible Reformation of the Drink Traffic, 586; Reform of the Drink Traffic, 728.
RANSOM, Rastus S., How to Check Testamentary Litigation, 661.
RAYMOND, E. H. Ancient and Modern Dentistry, 631.
Recent Hypnotics, Insomnia and, 78.
Recollections of the Panama Canal Congress, 136.
Recollections of George Sand, 293.
Reform of the Drink Traffic, 728.
Review, The Lesson of the Naval, 641.
RHOADES, J. H. A Warning to Savings-Bank Depositors, 177.
RICKOFF, B. M. A Reply to Amélie Rives, 377.
ROBINSON, H. P. A Railway Party in Politics, 552.
RUSK, J. M. American Farming a Hundred Years Hence, 257

SAN CARLOS, MARQUISE DE. Middle Class Life in France, 478.
Sand, George, Recollections of, 293.
Sandwich Islands, The, 265.
SARGENT, F. P. The Ann Arbor Strike, 561.
Savings-Bank Depositors, A Warning to, 177.
Schools, The American Common, 254.
Science and the Woman's Question, 248.
Secrecy, The Abuse of, 505.
SHALER, N. S. High Buildings and Earthquakes, 338.
Shall Immigration Be Suspended? 1.
Shall Our Laws Be Codified? 204.
Ship Building Here and Abroad, 398.
Shylock, In the Interest of, 171.
Sing Po's Chart, 629.
Solutions of the Labor Problem, 61.
Spain at the World's Fair, 332.
Spencer, Mr. Herbert, A Bible Lesson for, 87.
SPRINGER, W. M. How to Revise the Tariff, 129.
Stag Hunting in Devon and Somerest, Wild, 186.
STANTON, THEODORE. French Section at World's Fair, The, 241.
Statehood, Claims to, 346.
STEWART, GEORGE. Canada at the World's Fair, 613; Canadian Question, The, 382.
Strike, The Ann Arbor, 561.
Students as Showmen, 123.
Surgery, Brain, 390.
SYKES, LADY. Two Englishwomen on America, 456.

TAFT, OREN B. Labor Organizations in Law, 65.
Tariff, How to Revise the, 129.
TATENO, GOZO. Japan at the World's Fair, 34.
Telescope, Possibilities of the, 48.
Testamentary Litigation, How to Check, 661.
Theology, The Decadence of, 576.
Thirty Knots an Hour to Europe, 717.
Thoughts Suggested by Prof. Dewar's Discoveries, 543.
THURSTON, L. A. The Advantages of An nexation, 265.
TRACY, B. F. The Behring Sea Case, 513.
TRICKETT, CHAS. W. Mistakes, But Not of Moses, 247.
Two Englishwomen on America, 449.
Two Hundred Years, The Art of Living, 755.

Uncut Diamond, An, 122.
United States and Great Britain, Political Organizations in, 105.
Universal Suffrage in France, 27.

VAMBÉRY, A. England in the Orient, 359.
VEAZEY, W. G. Further Views of Pension List Revision, 618.
Vigilance League, Our City, 98.

Warning to Savings-Bank Depositors, A, 177.
Wealth Producers, Who Are the Greatest? 648.
Who Are the Greatest Wealth Producers? 648.
Why Immigration Should Not Be Suspended, 220.
Wild Stag Hunting in Devon and Somerset, 186.
Which Is the Best Form of Life Insurance? 594.
WILSON, R. P. C. How Shall the Pension List Be Revised, 416.
Wiman, Erastus. The Hope of a Home, 228.
Wives, Flirting, 69.
Woman's Question, Science and the, 248.
WOOD, HENRY TRUEMAN. British Section at World's Fair, 237.
World's Fair, Canada at the, 13.
World's Fair, Charges at the, 385.
World's Fair, Europe at the, 237.
World's Fair, Foreign Nations at the, 34, 237, 332, 611.
World's Fair, Italy at the, 43.
World's Fair, Japan at the, 34.
World's Fair, Persia at the, 611.
World's Fair, Police Protection at the, 711.
World's Fair, Spain at the, 332.
World's Fair, The British Section at the, 237.
World's Fair, The French Section at the, 241.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXXIV.

JANUARY, 1893.

SHALL IMMIGRATION BE SUSPENDED?

BY THE HON. W. E. CHANDLER, CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION.

OPPORTUNITIES come to nations as well as to individuals, and they must not be neglected. A republic especially should be prompt to seize its opportunity; for, while a monarchy or despotism can act on the impulse of one ruler or a few rulers, many minds must concur to put a republic in motion. When the people, or their representatives in the legislature, are ready, there should be no delay or hesitation, or the opportunity may past.

To the United States there is now offered an opportunity so make a wise initial movement towards the restriction of immigration, some of whose existing evils an almost universal feeling demands should be immediately checked. A concurrence of imperative reasons favors the suspension of all immigration for the year 1893, during which period suitable conditions for its resumption may be fixed and promulgated.

What are the reasons for such suspension, and what are the objections and the answers thereto?

I.

There is already a virtual suspension which may be easily prolonged.

The cholera of 1892 has almost stopped immigration. It will not be resumed in full proportions before the spring of 1893. This cessation should be prolonged by law until new conditions

Copyright, 1892, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

are matured under which immigration for settlement in the United States may be resumed. The interest and anxiety manifested during the last few years by the American people concerning the enormous inroads of inferior immigrants have been supplemented by the outbreak of cholera in Europe, by its presence in the harbor of New York, and its advent into the city itself. The evil was limited and the danger averted, only by the virtual suppression of immigration from certain countries. It will be the highest wisdom to take advantage of this fortuitous circumstance to continue the suspension until a new policy can be adopted by the United States covering the whole subject of immigration into its territory.

II.

The cholera again threatens us, and can only be averted by the suspension of immigration.

Not only will it be wise on general grounds to take advantage of the suspension of immigration which the cholera of 1892 has caused, to continue the same for 1893, but there is no other safe method of averting an invasion of cholera in the coming year. The most eminent authorities assert that the suspension of all immigration is the best way to keep out the cholera. Many believe that it is the only reasonably sure method.

It is not believed that the cholera germs are now here, although it is possible that they are. There will be another outbreak of cholera in Europe; indeed it has already appeared there. If it comes to this country, it will be brought with the immigrants in the steerages of the steamships. There is no serious danger from cabin passengers coming as visitors.

If there is no suspension of immigration it will be indispensable to secure the adoption and observance of the most rigid precautions and rules in the European ports, for a period before the sailings of emigrant vessels, and the maintenance of strict regulations during the voyages. For this strictness we must depend upon foreign officials and the officers of the steamship companies and not upon ourselves. No one believes that we can prescribe and enforce upon foreign governments and the steamship officers such measures as will keep the cholera from coming here. It will sail into our ports and overtax all the resources of our quarantine and health authorities, and will alarm and distress our

whole people, even if it does not widely break into our borders and ravage our homes. If we allow immigration we are largely at the mercy of foreigners. If we suspend it our lives are in our own hands. In suspension alone is there any certainty of safety.

III.

Protection to the World's Fair requires the suspension.

The Columbian Exposition at Chicago can only be protected from cholera, and made a success so far as foreign visitors are concerned, by the proposed suspension of immigration. We are inviting, and we very much desire, European visitors to the World's Fair. They will not come in the same steamships with swarms of immigrants, nor will they come even in steamships bringing no steerage passengers if they are to encounter the immigrants upon the docks of the steamship companies. Two currents, one of cabin passengers coming as visitors, and one of immigrants, will not cross the ocean side by side. One or the other will stop, and that one should be the current of immigrants.

It is certain that there is to be some cholera in Europe. If there is also to be cholera in the United States, Europeans will not come here. If, however, it can be made tolerably certain, as it can, by the suspension of immigration, that there will be no cholera in the United States, foreigners will come here in large numbers. It will be the safest place for them to visit, indeed it will be the only place in the world which they can visit where they will be reasonably sure to avoid cholera.

The success of the World's Fair may be possible even without many foreign visitors. But such success will not be possible with any considerable amount of cholera in the United States. With cholera existing anywhere in this country Chicago will be the last place to which Americans will go. They will stay at home or flee to the mountains; they will not go to the city of Chicago. The case seems too clear for argument. It is an absolutely imperative necessity for the welfare of the Columbian Exposition, either as a resort for Americans alone or for Americans and foreigners as well, that European immigration shall be suspended. It is unfortunate for the Exposition that it is to be held during the second of a series of cholera years, but the misfortune exists. The failure of the Fair can be averted by simply asking immigrants who wish to come for settlement to delay their departure for one year.

IV.

A year's suspension is necessary for the preparation of permanent restrictive measures.

The suspension of all immigration for one year will give the much needed time for the discussion and preparation of suitable permanent measures of restriction, which can be announced as conditions of the resumption of immigration. There is an almost universal feeling in favor of greater restrictions than the law now imposes, but there is no unanimity of opinion as to what the new restrictive measures should be.

We may go on for years under the present laws without coming to an agreement which will take the shape of new laws of Congress. We need to bring the subject to a head by taking advantage of the temporary suspension of immigration, made necessary by existing circumstances. All persons now discussing the subject of further measures of restriction can agree to a temporary suspension of immigration, although they differ as to what new methods of restriction should be permanently adopted—the sentiment varying from the advocacy of a system almost amounting to the exclusion of new settlers, to plans which would very little, if at all, increase the stringency of the present laws.

It is highly advisable to bring the debate to a close, and to determine our fixed policy as to immigration. The debate will end, and decision will be reached, if the one year's suspension can be preliminarily agreed upon.

V.

No serious injustice will be done to persons intending to emigrate.

The principal objection that will be made to the proposed one year's suspension is that it will work an injustice to persons desiring to emigrate to the United States in the year 1893, especially to those who wish to come to join families already here. The hardship diminishes, however, upon thoughtful consideration. It is not a severe repulse to ask persons in other countries who desire to come to America to make homes here, but who have no families now here whom they wish to join, to wait one year before coming, in view of the apprehensions about cholera. It is a greater hardship to prevent persons from coming during the year to join families now here, but this, which would be the

severest result, is not unreasonable when compared with the advantages to be secured by the suspension.

It is to be borne in mind that, while persons cannot come during the suspension for the purpose of settlement, they may come as visitors, under the obligation to return, which may be enforced according to the judgment of the United States authorities.

VI.

The steamship companies will not be injured.

It has been assumed that the suspension of immigration will be strenuously opposed by the steamship companies engaged in transporting passengers across the Atlantic. This can hardly be possible, if the steamship managers will carefully consider the situation. If they continue to bring immigrants during 1893 very onerous conditions will certainly be imposed, if the United States can establish them. Heavy expenses abroad must be incurred by the companies before the immigrants start, and expensive precautions kept up on the voyage over. Upon the arrival, if there is any suspicious sickness on board, will happen the inevitable quarantine, which destroys all profits from the voyage, besides absorbing much other money of the companies. Even in the absence of any compulsory statute, it will be for the real interest of the steamship companies to discontinue carrying immigrant passengers during the coming year, especially when it is considered that it is almost certain that if immigrants come cabin passengers will not come. The ruin of the cabin-passenger business will be poorly compensated for by the uncertain profits to be sought from immigrant passengers.

VII.

European immigrants will not come through Canada.

It is said that if immigration by water directly through United States ports is prohibited, the immigrants will come through Canada. This objection can be dismissed as not serious. A prohibition of immigration by a law making it unlawful for an immigrant to come, and subjecting him, if he does come, to expulsion within one year, and also imposing penalties upon persons bringing or aiding in bringing unlawful immigrants, will almost enforce itself. Any evasion of the law will be too difficult to be profitable. It will require two transactions: first, the purchase

of a ticket and the taking of a voyage from Europe to Canada; next, the purchase of a ticket and the transit across the border into the United States. These two transactions will not be undertaken in order to avoid one year's delay in getting into the United States, particularly as the risk is incurred of arrest, expulsion, and a penalty upon all aiders and abettors in the migration who may come within the reach of our laws.

Practically, the exclusion will be made operative by placing United States inspectors upon the docks of the steamships which come into Halifax, Quebec, and Montreal, who, with Canadian inspectors, will examine the arriving passengers, allowing visitors to go but detaining immigrants. The Canadian authorities, to avoid rigid inspections of railroad trains crossing our borders, will gladly allow and facilitate such inspections at the seaports.

VIII.

What should be the conditions of the resumption of immigration after suspension?

With such a concurrence of reasons in favor of one year's suspension of immigration, and such a freedom from sound objections thereto, the suspension ought to be enacted into a law, even if the resumption of immigration takes place at the end of the year without any restrictions except those now imposed by law. But it is due to frankness, it being stated that it is intended to allow resumption only under new conditions, that some reference should be made to the new conditions most advocated.

Residence, and that citizenship which follows residence, in the United States are so valuable that it is highly reasonable that persons or families in European countries who intend coming here to make new homes, should satisfy the United States consul nearest to the home of their birth that they are not excluded from coming by any law, and due weight should be given to the consul's certificate, produced on the arrival in the United States. Nearly all plans for the restriction of immigration have embodied a system of investigation on the other side of the ocean before the departure of the immigrant. The nearer this inspection is to the home of the person intending emigration the better. His facilities for proof are most available there, and if he cannot come it is not wise that he should start.

A prominent objection to the consular certificates is, that the

requirement of them will prevent emigrants from getting away whom their own governments wish to detain for military purposes, especially the Germans, who are among our best immigrants. This objection raises the question whether the United States really wishes to take as its citizens, away from foreign countries, any citizens of the latter whom their governments are unwilling to allow to depart. The soundest answer is the negative.

The expediency of requiring an educational and a property qualification, as conditions of the admission of immigrants, is being widely considered by American thinkers and writers. Do we wish to receive single persons who cannot read or write their own language, or families, the members of which cannot read or write their own language? Do we wish to take penniless persons or families, or shall we require that they have moderate means of subsistence for a reasonable period after landing? The wise answer to these questions would lead to the requirement of an educational and a property qualification.

There has been much argument in favor of a large head tax, but this country will hardly make the question of admission or rejection of a foreigner depend upon his ability to pay a certain amount of money into its treasury. We do not wish to get an income from immigrants beyond the expenses of administering the immigration laws. Whatever money they have, we wish them to keep and use while settling themselves in their new world.

The writer of this article believes the system of consular inspections and certificates, and the requirement of a moderate educational and property qualification, accompanied by reasonable provisions for an honest administration of the naturalization laws, will be sufficient guards for some time to come against the evils most to be apprehended from foreign immigration into this country. The Fifty-third Congress ought to be able to reach a speedy and satisfactory decision on all these questions.

It is not the purpose of this paper to recite the arguments for restricting immigration. They are based largely upon evils which have been made apparent by the vast increase, within recent years, of degraded immigrants from Italy, Turkey, Hungary, Poland and Russia proper. The statistics alone tell the story:

Among the alien passengers over sixteen years of age who landed at the port of New York from February 1 to October 31, 1892, inclusive, the number of illiterates in one hundred persons was: From England, 10; Ireland, 8; Wales, 6; Scotland, 1½; France, 2; Germany, 2; Switzerland, 1; and from Denmark, Norway and

Sweden, each less than 1 ; while the number in one hundred from Russia proper was 20 ; Poland, 56 ; Hungary, 23 ; Armenia, 44 ; and from Italy, 66.

The number of immigrants in 1870 was: From Italy, 2,891 ; Hungary, none ; Poland, 223 ; Russia proper, 907—making 4,021 ; while for 1890 there came from Italy, 51,799 ; Hungary, 5,473 ; Poland, 11,073 ; and from Russia proper, 35,147—making 101,492.

The immigration in 1892 from January 1 to October 31 was : From Italy, 51,842 ; Hungary, 31,220 ; Poland, 26,600 ; and from Russia proper, 51,606—making 161,268 for the ten months, notwithstanding immigration was practically suspended by the cholera quarantine during September and October.

These evils are crying and intolerable. We cannot safely undertake the assimilation of the ignorant and debased human beings who are tending towards us from such sources.

No indiscriminate opposition to the admission of all foreigners of any particular races (except the Asiatic) is contemplated by any one. Our present foreign-born citizens of European extraction, not including these importations of recent years, are among the best of Americans. They ought to be willing, they are willing, to join in excluding the classes of immigrants against whom the reluctance of all true Americans is now being expressed. The exclusion of these is required for the maintenance of a high order of American civilization, and, moreover, in the interest of the intelligent labor of the wage-workers of the continent. The United States is a country of high wages and it is to be hoped, for the sake of the prosperity and character of its legal voters, that it will long remain a republic of high wages. It cannot so remain unless the f[illegible]esirable immigrants who have been recently swarming to [illegible]oors is courageously driven back.

The labor organizations of the country, without exception, ask for more restrictive immigration laws. Those labor organizations contributed in a large degree to bring about the result of the recent Presidential election. They do not ask that further immigration of foreigners to the United States to become citizens shall be absolutely prohibited for any considerable period, nor do they ask anything justly obnoxious to the clause in the platform upon which the President-elect was nominated, but they do demand the suspension of immigration for one year, and the adoption during that year of such reasonable new restrictions, to be enforced after the year's expiration, as will measurably, if not completely, protect the labor and the citizenship of America from the degradation with which recent incursions of persons, unfitted for citizenship, have been threatening our people.

W. E. CHANDLER.

THE LIMITS OF LEGITIMATE RELIGIOUS DISCUSSION.

BY THE RIGHT REV. LEIGHTON COLEMAN, S. T. D., LL. D., BISHOP OF DELAWARE.

THERE is a discussion styled religious that is not legitimate. It is such as calls into question the fundamental principles of religion. Any discussion which involves disrespect to them transcends its proper bounds.

Of course, there must be among the disputants, or on the part of those who would pass judgment upon the legitimacy of such discussions, an agreement as to what is meant by the term Religion.

My own view of the subject shall be confined to the United States. The inquiry will at once arise: "Is there here any form of religion which may be called national, which its adherents may on that account consider entitled, so far as its fundamental principles are concerned, to limitation of debate?"

Without hesitation, I answer "Yes." From the very beginning of its colonization, this country has distinctly recognized Christianity as its religion. It is just as easy to prove its formal and constant acknowledgment in the beginning as it is to prove that there is no such formal acknowledgment in our present national constitution. Yet this very lack of formal acknowledgment, when considered in connection with the fact that Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, can be fairly considered as testifying not only to the existence, but, also, to the supremacy of Christianity: for, as one of the things belonging to God, Cæsar is not to meddle with it. The federal constitution, taken together with "the laws in pursuance thereof," may be said to be founded not only upon, but in,

Christianity—the existence of which is throughout pre-supposed. The appointment of chaplains for both army and navy and their payment out of the common funds are facts which are not to be overlooked in the consideration of this same point.

In further support of the contention that Christianity is the national religion of America I would not only appeal—as one can do very confidently—to the common sentiment and practice of all classes, but also to the well-weighed utterances of the judiciary, from the first days of our political independence.

It may suffice to adduce one or two authorities on this point. Chancellor Kent, of New York, delivered, in 1811, the following opinion: "The people of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity as their faith and practice." True, he went on to say, "The Constitution has discarded religious establishments," but what then? "It does not forbid judicial cognizance of those offences against religion and morality which have no reference to any such establishment, or to any particular form of government, but are punishable because they strike at the root of moral obligation and weaken the security of social ties." He added: "To construe it as breaking down the common-law barriers against licentious, wanton and impious attacks upon Christianity itself, would be an enormous perversion of its meaning."*

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania subsequently ruled that "even if Christianity were not a part of the law of the land, it is the popular religion of the country; an insult to which would be indictable as tending to disturb the public peace"; adding that "no society can tolerate a wilful and despiteful attempt to subvert religion."† This same court annulled a will made in favor of a society of so-called atheists, on the ground that the State law recognized none but literary, charitable and religious societies.

So, then, I repeat that a discussion which would include within its limits an attack upon the fundamental principles of Christianity is, so far as that attack is concerned, distinctly illegitimate.

We recognize this dogma when applied to civil affairs. When a citizen essays to bring into disrepute the fundamental principles of that form of government under which he is living, he is ac-

* 8 Johns, 290.
† 11 Serg. & R., 394.

counted a traitor, and is liable to arrest and punishment. It is within the remembrance of many how often and how severely such offences were treated during the period of our Civil War. And the same rigor is observed in some European countries to-day.

Furthermore, in some of the things as to whose discussion there is a limit affixed by the State, there is much that does not approve itself to our reason, and much more, perchance, that is not to our liking. But, for all that, the charge and danger of treason remain the same.

Is it not much more treasonable to bring into contempt the institutions and tenets of Christianity? And especially so, since it is a time of war? For in the conflict which Christianity is waging there is no discharge. It will last as long as the world in which we live. Therefore it is that a perpetual limit must be placed to the questioning or denial, by way of discussion, of such things as are essential to Christianity.

Hardly anything is more injurious to the State than a lack of confidence between man and man. It threatens the disruption of the very bonds of society. And this is the risk that is run in allowing religious discussions to go on indefinitely and wantonly, robbing men of their faith in God and Christ, and so, in time, of their faith in one another, for faith in man has its highest development among those who believe in God.

It may now be time to give some indication of what is here meant by the fundamental principles of Christianity. None is more distinctly so than a belief in the personality of its founder, Jesus Christ. And with this belief in His personality is the equally fundamental belief in Him as both God and Man.

But few persons question the fact of His existence. More refuse to acknowledge His Divinity. And herein lies a transgression of the limits of legitimate religious discussion. Indeed, one who denies the Divinity of Christ takes himself out of religious discussion altogether—at least so far as this country is concerned. He robs Christianity of that which primarily makes it *the* religion of the world, and reduces it simply to a system of wilful deceit and shameless wickedness. For if knowing, or even suspecting, that Christ was only human, His disciples claim that He is Divine, and because of His Divinity insist upon certain things as necessary for membership in Him, they surely are most irre-

ligious, and their creed can have no place in the discussions of those who would be accounted even moral men.

But, believing as they do, and by faith seeing * that Christ is God, and resting upon this cardinal article all the other articles of their faith, it is not difficult to understand how aggrieved they feel whensoever His Divinity is disputed, and, by necessary inference, if not by direct assertion, His goodness is denied. Such an assault is beyond the pale of legitimate discussion.

I would not condescend to enter into a debate with one who should wish to discuss the character of my mother—that is, as to her goodness. I certainly would draw the limit there.

Shall I be compelled to discuss religious matters with one who does not recognize Christ's Divinity? For it is because we know that He is more than human, and therefore perfect and beyond any human criticism, that we feel that any assault upon His character is out of place in a land that is at least professedly Christian.

It is on this account that one cannot but regret the recent appearance in this REVIEW of an article which, while professing to be a review of the life and works of a French author, lately deceased, was really an arraignment of Christianity, and a wanton attack not only upon Christ's claim to Divinity, but also upon His goodness of character.

Such an article certainly transgresses those bounds of religious discussion which I have ventured to lay down; and this not only because of assailing the fundamental principles of Christianity, but, further, because of its vain repetition of what has been so many times answered with such unquestionable reasonableness. Really the disciples of Christ's religion have good grounds for insisting that its verity should not be so frequently impugned with stale, worn-out, and a hundred-times-answered statements and arguments. May they not, with good grace, insist upon some limitations in this respect?

Such repetitions do but little credit to those intellectual gifts to whose exercise the impossibility of accepting Christianity is attributed. It is Locke, I think, that suggests the folly of extinguishing reason in order to exalt faith, as though a man would put out his eyes in order to see better with a telescope. Is not the converse of this equally true? Of what use are the eyes without the telescope, except to see dimly and uncertainly?

* Hebrews xi., 1.

May we not say that in the truths of Christianity we have reason in its highest form? Without them, indeed, reason oft-times becomes only another name for will, and is set against conscience. As has been said by one of old: "We must have a reason for that which we believe above reason." Men will think and speak of the fellowship of gifted intellects, putting the mind in place of character. And then, having dethroned moral excellence, they begin to think all religions alike—giving but little value to any of them. They become, as it were, color-blind. It is not then difficult, having undervalued religion, to go on and despise it.

Thus our reasoning powers when alone, without the aid of the Spirit of God, are likely—nay, one may say certain—to become most weak and untrustworthy in dealing with moral and religious truth.

Christians acknowledge, readily enough, that there are mysteries beyond, though not contradictory to, our reason. Our opponents deny this, and insist upon understanding all things. And, when they come to such as pass their comprehension, these are rejected as untrue. They would substitute for Christianity a human system or theory.

Lotze, in his "Microcosmus," fairly describes the relation of reason to mysteries when he says: "If reason is not of itself capable of finding the highest truth, but on the contrary stands in need of a revelation, still, reason must be able to understand the revealed truth, at least so far as to recognize in it the satisfying and convincing conclusion of those upward-soaring trains of thought which reason itself began, led by its own needs, but was not able to bring to an end."*

Christianity, therefore, is the religion of reason, and of reason in its strength and purity. It is the answer to the soul's deepest and truest wants; and of its common wants. Thus, as related to all men, it is a religion of history. It is founded on facts. The first Adam was no myth. Neither is the second Adam an abstract idea. Christ is—not only was, but *is*—a person.

And it is as being a person of perfection, the Incarnate Son of God Himself, that we feel that in assaulting Christianity *He* is assaulted, and in assaulting *Him* all virtue and all grace are likewise assaulted, and that in assaulting them the very foundations

* II., p. 660.

of our life are liable to be overthrown. This sensitiveness to any attack upon our blessed Lord is shared in common by all who are really entitled to the name of Christian; for, however true it is (and it is one of the saddest of all truths) that many divisions exist among Christians, yet it is equally true that to all alike the doctrine of Christ's Divinity and of man's salvation through His Atonement is too dear to allow it to be questioned by any one. Again, I say, there must be limits set to such assaults.

And these limits I would set not only as regards the discussion of His nature and His character, but also as regards the discussion of His commandments. Let me illustrate my meaning here by reference to the two great Sacraments of the Christian religion, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. These were unquestionably ordained by Christ Himself. And they are accounted "as generally necessary to salvation." Yet how largely are they ignored by people living in these United States. And how flippantly, oftentimes, is the question of their obligation discussed! The question, I submit, is beyond the legitimate limits of a religious discussion. It is treasonable to the King of kings, and thus becomes in itself irreligious.

I am quite prepared to admit that there are some points in regard to the sacraments which may be legitimately discussed, *e. g.*, the *mode* of Baptism. But as to their necessity, there is no room for debate. That question has been settled, and whoever, by argument or by practice, shows disrespect to such a fundamental principle of the Kingdom puts himself out of court, and is, I repeat it, guilty of treason. It is not an open question. In fact, it has never been anything else but a closed question, except as those who are rebellious have dared to debate it.

And what makes this impiety all the more deplorable is that it belongs in many instances to those who pride themselves upon their morality, and who are acknowledged by others as moral men, but who, in my judgment, are very far from deserving a place in such a category. For what is morality? Primarily it means living according to custom or rule. Thence it comes to mean living according to the law of right and wrong. And since Christianity, above all other systems of principles, informs man as to his duty, its standard must needs be his guide if he be sincerely determined to fulfil his duty. Customs exist so long as public opinion allows them to exist. Now, the public opinion of

this country is Christian opinion. Therefore, our national morality in its highest form is virtually but another name for Christianity. The morality of a heathen country is quite different from the morality of a Christian country. An American who proposes to be governed by what he terms moral principles must be prepared to acknowledge the claims of Christ's religion. In other words, a man who is not a Christian cannot be accounted a moral man.

I know how liable one is to be misunderstood who sets up such a strong claim for Christianity, but in setting up a weaker claim one is thereby lowering the standard of morality. For while it is true that by our unduly magnifying morality we belittle Christianity, it is equally true that in belittling Christianity we degrade morality.

We are much too lenient as to the immorality of so-called moral men; of men who while they select certain precepts for their obedience treat with disdain other precepts just as binding upon their consciences. A really Christian man is always a moral man; but he who is only what the world calls moral may be very far from being a Christian man. A really Christian man, I say, for one is well aware how oftentimes this word Christian is claimed by and allowed to persons who do not accept in its integrity—one might say in its simplest form of meaning—the Catholic doctrine of the Divine Sonship, a Sonship not enjoyed in common by all men, but exclusively by Christ Himself.

There is a vagueness in the belief of some so-called Christian people as to this absolute equality of Christ with God, in His Divine nature, which seems to make the line of distinction between them and others very slight. Their character and their life are high and commendable in many respects, but when their belief in Christ is pressed to its real elements it is found to be far short of that which has ever been maintained by the real confessors of the Church. In other words, it is only a belief in Him as human; human on a higher plane, it may be, than any other being, but still beneath the plane of God Himself.

It is thus that I find myself immovably opposed to considering any one worthy of the name of Christian who fails to accept the terms of fellowship in Him which He Himself unequivocally lays down. Can it be otherwise than degrading to Him to allow the name Christian to such as reject the very fundamental prin-

ciples of the Master, after whom they profess to call themselves? As well might one call himself a Free Mason who disbelieved in the principles of that ancient order, or reckon himself a disciple of Copernicus who rejected the theory associated with that name.

One other apparent digression. I have spoken of people called moral by the world. Here again I would recognize their claim to respect on account of their freedom from transgressing the laws of man and, it may be, some of the laws of God. But inasmuch as in regard to other laws of God (*e. g.*, such as relate to Baptism and the Lord's Supper), they are deliberately and continuously guilty, I feel constrained to withhold from them the appellation so frequently given them. There is need to repeat to-day in every community the maxim of St. James: "For, whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all."*

Holding such views concerning the significance of the terms Christian and moral, I cannot but feel that persons who venture to deny the divinity of our Blessed Lord and the obligations of His sacraments practically transgress the limits of legitimate religious discussion, inasmuch as these principles are fundamental to its existence.

It is out of no fear of the ultimate issue of what I have here described as illegitimate religious discussion that I insist upon limits being set. The truth is always stronger than any attack upon it, and the history of Christianity affords the strongest encouragement to its believers to-day. But one cannot help feeling deeply concerned for the welfare of those who make attacks upon it, and so, to free them from danger—danger of which no human pen can fully write—one earnestly demands that a limit should be set. No one can consider the result of even a flippant word against Christianity without realizing the peril in which those who hear it may be placed. The very safety and welfare of the community, in its highest rights and privileges, are endangered if there be limitless questioning of the truths which accompany salvation.

In this connection there come up, all unbidden, the solemn words of St. Peter† describing those who "deny the Lord that bought them" and others who "follow their per-

* St. James. II., 10.
† II. St. Peter. 2.

nicious ways." It is the old question of authority. Men resent dogmatic teaching to-day, as in the days of old. They resent it not only because of what may thus be taught, but because of its putting boundaries to their own conclusions. As of old, these limits are set for men's advantage. It is because of such limits that men are freed from the bondage of irresponsible and dangerous opinions and are held to that truth in whose integrity alone there is absolute liberty.

Speculations are restrained, but belief becomes certainty. It is with no "perhaps" that a soul which has lived within the bounds of revealed religion anticipates the eternal change, but its language is "I KNOW that my Redeemer liveth."

LEIGHTON COLEMAN.

INSOMNIA AND RECENT HYPNOTICS.

BY WILLIAM A. HAMMOND, M. D., SURGEON-GENERAL U. S. ARMY (RETIRED).

THERE is no more prevalent condition of mental derangement than the inability to sleep. The state of excitement in which people of the present day live, the demands of business, the struggle for wealth and position, all of which were never so great as in our own time, produce just that state of the brain which, if continued not only through the day but far into the night, makes sound and healthy sleep an impossibility.

I am aware that the mere assertion of this fact will not carry half as much weight to the mind of the educated layman as will a few words explaining what sleep is and in what its opposite condition, wakefulness, consists, and I therefore propose, before touching upon the subject of recently discovered sleep-producers, to make their action intelligible by describing briefly what they have to do and how they do it.

Observations made of those persons whom accident or disease has rendered fit subjects for investigation, and experiments conducted with all necessary precautions to insure accuracy, show beyond doubt that sleep is the result of a diminution of the quantity of blood circulating through the brain. Thus Blumenbach, nearly seventy years ago, detailed the case of a young man eighteen years of age who had fallen from a height and fractured his skull, losing a large portion of the bone. After recovery took place a depression remained, covered only by the scalp. While the young man was awake this chasm was quite superficial, but as soon as sleep ensued it became very deep. The change was evidently due to the fact that during sleep the brain was in a collapsed condition from a diminished amount of blood in the cerebral vessels, while when awake the quantity was increased and the scalp correspondingly elevated.

Again in 1821 a woman in Montpelier, France, lost part of her skull by a severe accident and the brain and its membranes

lay bare. When she was in deep sleep the organ remained motionless beneath the crest of the cranial bones. When she was dreaming it became somewhat elevated and when she was awake it protruded from the fissure in the skull.

It is a well-known fact that in young infants there are two openings in the cranium so that at those places the brain and its membranes are only covered by the scalp. Observation shows us that when these infants are awake the integument is raised considerably above the level of the skull, while when asleep it is correspondingly depressed.

Experiments performed for the express purpose of ascertaining the cause of sleep, confirm the results deduced from the observations cited.

Mr. Durham, a distinguished English surgeon, some thirty years ago trephined the skull of a dog and observed when the brain was exposed to view, that its surface, while the animal was asleep, became pale and sank below the level of the bone; the veins ceased to be distended and many which had been full of dark blood could no longer be perceived. When the animal was roused the surface of the brain became suffused with a red blush and it ascended to the opening through the skull. As the mental excitement increased the brain became more and more turgid with blood and innumerable vessels sprang into sight. After being fed the animal fell asleep and the brain again became contracted and pale. In all these observations the contrast between the two conditions was exceedingly well marked.

Several years ago I became greatly interested in the subject of sleep and its derangements, and from many observations and experiments the conclusion was irresistibly reached that sleep is directly the result of a diminished amount of blood flowing through the brain.

In 1854, when, as a medical officer of the army, I was stationed at Fort Riley, in Kansas, a man came under my notice who had, through a frightful railway accident, lost about eighteen square inches of his skull. There was thus a fissure of his cranium three inches wide and six inches long. The man, who was employed as a wood-chopper, was subject to severe and frequent epileptic fits, during which I often attended him. When he was awake the region of scalp in question was always nearly on a level with the upper surface of the cranial bones. In the act of going to

sleep it gradually sank until it was more than half an inch lower than it had previously been. At the very instant of awaking the scalp rose to its usual height.

Many experiments which I have performed upon animals lead to results identical with those obtained by Durham, and by means of an instrument screwed into an opening in the skull, and acting in a manner similar to that of a barometer, the intra-cranial pressure can be accurately measured. By this instrument it is shown that during sleep the liquid falls in the tube, while when wakefulness is present, the liquid rises. During the first-named condition, therefore, the pressure is lessened, and this can only be due to a diminution in the quantity of blood in the brain. During the second-named condition the pressure is increased, and this can only result from an augmentation in the volume of the cerebral blood.

There are a great many other reasons that could be brought forward in support of this theory, but the foregoing are sufficient to establish the point. The *immediate* cause of sleep, therefore, is a diminution of the quantity of blood circulating in the vessels of the brain. The *exciting* cause of periodical and natural sleep is the necessity which exists that the loss of substance which the brain has undergone during its state of greatest activity should be restored. To use the simile of the steam engine, the fires are lowered and the operators go to work to repair damages and put the machine in order for the next day's work.

From all this, we know that whatever increases the amount of blood in the brain tends to produce wakefulness, and that whatever lessens the quantity is productive of sleep.

Now, it happens in this stirring age of ours that men—and women too—are worked so much intellectually, or are so emotionally disturbed, that their brains have more to do than they can accomplish, and yet preserve their normal balance. Mental work, whether it be simply perceptional, intellectual, emotional or volitional, requires that an increased amount of blood shall flow to the brain; hence, during mental exertion of any kind, the cerebral vessels become distended owing to the increased volume of blood they contain, and they remain in this condition as long as the exertion is continued. If it be too intense, or if it be persevered in for too long a period without adequate alternations of rest, the vessels lose their contractibility, and remain in a perma-

nently enlarged state. They are, therefore, not able to contract so as to produce sleep. A state of cerebral congestion is established, and wakefulness is the result.

Such persons go to bed, perhaps, feeling as if they would sleep, but no sooner do their heads touch their pillows than their minds become inordinately active and they lie awake hour after hour recalling the events of the day or else indulging in the most preposterous thoughts. The blood-vessels will not empty themselves simply because they have lost the power to do so. They are like the India-rubber bands that we put around big packages and leave undisturbed for a long time. We try to use them again and we find that the elasticity, which they once possessed, has gone.

As wakefulness is therefore the result of an undue amount of blood flowing through the brain it follows that those agents, whether they be hygienic or strictly medical, that lessen the quantity, will cause sleep. There are many substances known to both physicians and laymen that accomplish this object, but in what I shall have to say on the subject of hypnotics, I shall limit myself to those medicines which are synthetical, that is, formed in the laboratory by the union of other substances of altogether different chemical and therapeutical properties. Some of these are made from coal-tar, that wonderful body to which we owe acetanilide or antifebrine, the so-called antipyrine and many other powerful remedies. All are organic but none of them, like morphine, strychnine, hyoscyamine, and hundreds of other active principles, exists, in a state of nature as a constituent of plants.

And, it is to be borne in mind by the reader, that I am writing simply to give him information in regard to an exceedingly interesting and important subject, a mere smattering, as it were, and not sufficient, even if he were possessed of a medical education, to enable him to use any one of the substances brought to his notice. Every well-educated person ought to have a general knowledge of medical science, and of the means and processes used by physicians and surgeons in the management of the diseases and injuries to which mankind is subject. But this no more qualifies him to use these means and processes himself than reading a work on popular astronomy would fit him to be the director of the Naval Observatory. He would be fully as likely to do as much injury in the one case as in the other. He would be working on his own body, and hence much more to his disadvantage than if he

were endeavoring to compute the orbits of comets or the periods of the rotation of the moons of Jupiter. No one of the substances that I am going to mention can be used, even by the physician, without his first obtaining a thorough knowledge of the constitution of his patient and of the disease he has to treat.

Paraldehyde.—Paraldehyde is a liquid possessing a strong odor of ether and a burning, followed by a cooling, taste, something like that of peppermint. It is of about the density of water, but its boiling point is much higher, being 255° F. At 50° F. it becomes solid. On account of its strong burning taste it is rarely administered in a pure form, being generally given in an emulsion, with mucilage or almond oil. It is particularly valuable as a hypnotic, owing to the fact that it does not tend to weaken the heart. A teaspoonful produces sleep in from five to fifteen minutes, and it is especially useful in those forms of insomnia which are accompanied by much mental excitement, such as we sometimes witness in the insane. A single dose of it can be detected in the breath twenty-four hours afterwards. It rarely if ever produces any gastric derangement and is rapidly absorbed by the stomach. In proper cases it is one of the most valuable of all the hypnotics, but though it has been ten years before the profession, it has scarcely passed beyond the knowledge of neurologists.

Amylene Hydrate.—This substance is one of the alcohols, is a fluid, colorless, with a strong affinity for water and with an odor and taste similar to that of camphor and peppermint. It readily mixes with water and alcohol. The dose as a hypnotic is from forty-five to sixty minims, but it is not very certain in its action, as it frequently produces mental excitement and wakefulness instead of sleep. It is, however, comparatively safe as it has no marked depressing effect on the respiratory or circulatory organs.

Methylal.—This substance, in its most obvious physical characteristics, strongly resembles paraldehyde, but it is of lower specific gravity and very much lower boiling point, this being only 107.6° F. Methylal, when administered internally, first causes a slight degree of excitement, which is generally followed by sound, refreshing sleep. Owing to the fact that it is rapidly eliminated from the lungs its effects are not very permanent, but this difficulty can be overcome by repeating the dose as often as occasion requires. I have very little personal experience with methylal,

as I have not been able to discover that it has any advantages over paraldehyde, while it is quite as disagreeable to the taste. It is said to be particularly beneficial in causing sleep in cases of *delirium tremens,* but I think this assertion is to be doubted.

Hypnone.—Hypnone is a colorless liquid with a sharp taste and a peculiar odor. It is somewhat heavier than water. It is not much used in medicine and the dose has to be constantly increased in order to obtain decided effects. It must be given with care, for it weakens the action of the heart and depresses the respiratory power, acting in this respect like chloral and chloroform. The dose is only two or three drops.

Sulphonal.—Although only introduced into medical use three years ago, sulphonal has become widely known and employed as a hypnotic. It occurs in prismatic crystals possessing neither smell nor color and being nearly tasteless. In proper doses, it produces sound and refreshing sleep, but it requires from two to four hours to act. Sulphonal was, at first, asserted to be a perfectly safe medicine. It was said to be free from exercising a depressing effect upon the heart and to be without deleterious influence on the respiratory or digestive organs. Continued experience, however, shows that its administration is not unattended with danger and several deaths from its use have been reported. It seems to have gotten extensively into the hands of the laity, many persons being in the habit of taking it on their own responsibility in order to secure sleep. I have witnessed several cases in which intense cardiac weakness, stupor, and even convulsions have been induced by its use. In one of these cases the patient was in the habit of taking several large doses in the course of the night in order to obtain sleep and generally with an unsuccessful result, for the consequences were frequently intense mental excitement, approaching acute mania in its intensity; twitchings of the arms and legs uncontrollable by the will, severe headache, dimness of sight and upon one occasion double vision. These symptoms did not pass off until late in the afternoon. He was on the verge of acquiring a sulphonal habit when he came under my observation.

Sulphonal is one of those substances, the quantity of which requires to be increased from time to time in order that the desired effect may be produced and hence the danger which attends upon its continued administration. Moreover, like chloral—which substance I shall presently consider—its effect appears to depend,

to a great extent, on the state of the patient's system at the time it is taken, and hence a dose that may be perfectly safe and beneficial at one time may cause very unpleasant effects at another.

It is scarcely possible to pick up a medical journal without finding the report of one or more cases in which sulphonal carelessly given or taken has been followed by alarming consequences or even by death itself. One reason why it has become such a favorite with persons who take the responsbility of being their own physicians, is the fact of its comparative freedom from taste and odor. But this slight advantage is more than counterbalanced by other qualities not so pleasant, but of much greater importance.

Chloralamid.—Chloralamid is one of the most recent hypnotics, and, judging by our experience up to this time, one of the most useful. It has a slightly bitter taste, and is not readily soluble in water, but it is promptly dissolved in alcohol. It appears to have no injurious action on the heart or respiration. The sleep that it produces is refreshing, and not so profound but that the subject wakes once or twice in the course of the night for a moment or two. It seems to be a pure hypnotic, no other marked effect upon the organs of the body besides the brain having as yet been observed. It simply contracts the cerebral blood-vessels, diminishing the amount of blood circulating in the substance of the brain and thus producing sleep. It begins to act within half an hour. It is a hypnotic even in the cases of those persons who are the subjects of acute pain, and would, therefore, otherwise pass the night in great discomfort.

It is likewise useful when capital operations have been performed and when sleep is so necessary for the organism. In the cases of persons suffering from nervous prostration or insanity, and in whom want of sleep is the prime cause of the nervous exhaustion they so frequently exhibit, chloralamid, when properly administered, is a remedy of inestimable value. Undoubtedly, however, the fact that no cases of its unpleasant results have yet been reported is due to the fact of its having been so short a while before the profession. As soon as the people get hold of it we shall surely have an experience of its effects very different from that which we now possess.

Urethrane.—This substance is not extensively employed in medicine although it has been in use since 1885. It exists in

colorless crystals, is odorless, and has a taste somewhat like that of salt-petre. It is dissolved readily in water and alcohol. It produces a quiet natural sleep, not followed by any unpleasant results. It is, however, uncertain in its action and hence cannot be relied upon when sleep is imperatively demanded. Nevertheless, I have occasionally seen it succeed when sulphonal and even chloral had failed.

Chloral.—Chloral was first made by Liebig, in 1832, by the action of chlorine on alcohol. Hence the name, consisting of the two first syllables of the words used to designate those substances. Although it has been known for over sixty years, it was only in 1869 that Liebreich introduced it into medical use. It at once took a prominent place among the hypnotics, and has perhaps been more used and more abused than all the rest of the recently discovered sleep-producers combined. It is employed in medicine in the form of a hydrate. As such, it is a white crystallized substance readily absorbing moisture from the atmosphere, and soluble in water or alcohol. It has a somewhat sharp taste and an odor slightly resembling that of chloroform. Chloral has a good many therapeutical applications, but it is only as a hypnotic that I shall here consider it.

The sleep produced by choral is natural in almost every respect. Its first effect when taken in a sleep-producing dose is a slight feeling of exhilaration which is soon followed by a sensation of *bien aise*, which gradually passes into somnolence. The duration of the sleep varies in accordance with the dose, and at its termination there is rarely headache or derangement of the digestive system. Experiments which I have performed with reference to the hypnotic effect of chloral show that it produces a true cerebral anæmia, and hence its power as a hypnotic.

Although small doses of chloral can generally be taken with safety, a large quantity acts as a poison to the heart, paralyzing this organ and therefore causing death. It likewise diminishes the excitability of the respiratory nerve centres and causes a rapid and marked fall in the temperature of the body.

Now there is one fact connected with the physiological action of chloral which is almost sufficient of itself to place it outside of the domain of therapeutics, and that is, the uncertainty, depending upon the individual to whom it is given, as to what constitutes a proper dose; and this as regards not only different persons but

the same person at different times. Thus a dose that at one time may produce sound and healthy sleep, without any ill consequences, may, at another time, cause many serious symptoms and even death.

I well remember the case of a lady whom I saw, in consultation with a young physician, in New York, soon after chloral was introduced to the profession, and whom, as she was afflicted with insomnia, I advised to take twenty-five grains of it. She took the dose, and, as I was informed the next day by her physician, with the happiest results. The wakefulness proved to be at that time of a temporary character, but about a year subsequently it returned, and her physician recalling to mind the good results of the twenty-five grains of chloral she had taken a year previously, repeated the dose. She at once passed into a condition of stupor from which she could not be aroused, and in less than two hours her heart had ceased to beat. I arrived at the house just in time to see her breathe her last. I have never given chloral since that day.

Liebreich's explanation of this uncertainty in the action of chloral is, that it is decomposed by the alkalinity of the blood and chloroform is set free. When the blood is slightly alkaline, the decomposition takes place slowly and sleep without unpleasant results follows, but when this fluid is strongly alkaline, decomposition ensues with great rapidity and the resulting chloroform poisons the heart.

The deaths from chloral have been very numerous, most of them occurring in persons who have been taking it on their own responsibility. As there are no means of knowing the state of the blood as regards its degree of alkalinity, the practice of taking chloral to produce sleep cannot be too severely condemned; and while I would not, perhaps, go so far as to say that it should never under any circumstances be employed in medicine, I am very sure that even with the utmost watchfulness and care on the part of the physician its use is not unattended with danger.

There is a chloral habit and hence we have a condition known as chloralism. This is probably the most deplorable of all those vices which a desire for stimulants and sedatives, for excitement and oblivion, has fastened upon our civilization; but its consideration does not fall within the scope of the present discussion.

WILLIAM A. HAMMOND

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE IN FRANCE.

BY M. JEAN MACÉ, LIFE SENATOR.

THE recent Presidential election in the United States, decided by universal suffrage, and the approaching contest in France for the choice of a new Chamber of Deputies, also to be settled by universal suffrage, may impart new interest to a brief account of the origin and present status in France of this mode of exercising sovereignty.

I was an eye-witness on February 25th, 1848, of the unexpected proclamation, in the streets of Paris, of universal suffrage. It was like a river which suddenly breaks through its dikes, imprudently weakened by the riparian dwellers. The spectacle which France presented to the world on that day was that of a country deluged during the night by an overflow of political rights without anybody being prepared for the disaster. But who could have stayed the torrent? All public authority had disappeared in the twinkling of an eye. It was necessary to be on the spot to obtain an exact idea of the description of revolution in the midst of which we Frenchmen found ourselves in the month of February, 1848. The story is worth relating.

During the July Monarchy nobody could vote unless he paid taxes amounting to 200 francs. But this figure once attained, the lucky citizen became a sort of petty sovereign, enjoying all the privileges pertaining to a country afflicted with a large budget whose dispensing was in the hands of a monarch. When studied closely, France is found to have been then a kind of republic—a republic of citizens paying 200 francs to the tax-gatherer, whose very humble servant was Louis Philippe, whatever his title may have been. "The legal country," as Guizot styled this political close corporation, was made up of about from two to three million voters; and Guizot was the man of their heart whom they kept in power for seven years.

The "outs," who were eager to have their turn in power, despairing of weakening Guizot's solid majority, thought that if they could enlarge the electorate they would have him on the hip. So they proposed to increase the number of voters by lowering the tax requirement to 150 francs and by enfranchising professional men, doctors, lawyers, professors, civil engineers, and all persons holding diplomas, who were declared to possess the necessary capacity for casting an intelligent vote. This was very far from universal suffrage. But it was nevertheless obstinately opposed by Guizot and his friends, who did not relish the idea of admitting to their charmed circle a lot of new-comers who would diminish by just so much their portion in the division of the spoils. This obstinacy of the "short-sighted conservatives"—a party cry which had immediate success—exasperated their opponents, who went from city to city, delivering fiery speeches at innumerable banquets. But these reformers, as greedy and selfish as those whom they combated, did not perceive that their words reached other ears than those at the banquet tables, and that the true country which embraced everybody was beginning to take part in the discussion.

At this same moment, as though arranged on purpose by the enemies of the ruling powers, rumors began to be noised about of scandals in high places, which were, of course, on every occasion, condemned by public opinion. In a word, one fine day, *apropos* of one of these banquets which Louis Philippe, weary of being vilified regularly at dessert, had prohibited, an outbreak occurred in the streets of Paris, and the King's government being attacked, at first only by a handful of malcontents, went to pieces suddenly under the weight of general indifference and dissatisfaction. Nobody overturned it, but everybody let it fall. While people, led by curiosity, were rushing from one quarter of the city to the other to ascertain what the condition of the combat actually was, the report began to circulate that the soldiers refused to fire on their fellow-citizens; that Louis Philippe had run away in a cab, and that there was no longer any king, ministers, government—or anything. The crowd surged into the hall where sat the representatives of "the legal country," swept them out as if they were so much straw, and then proclaimed the Republic, universal suffrage and a provisional government made up from those who

happened to be present. All this was done at once, and there was nothing left for France but to make the most of the situation. She finally extricated herself from the difficulty, as everybody now knows, by choosing a master.

The year had not ended when the seven millions of votes given on December 10th to a Bonaparte, showed too clearly and too late the tendencies of universal suffrage. There was no mistaking the meaning; it was not a President of the Republic, but an Emperor, whom universal suffrage had chosen. "A chief, a chief! We want a chief!" This cry of the election agents of the Prince-President, as he was soon to be called, is still ringing in my ears. The Republicans protested in vain; nobody listened to them. It was a refrain of the same sort that the supporters of Boulanger shouted through the streets of Paris and through the Departments during the critical hour of his popularity:

> "It is Boulange, lange, lange,
> It is Boulange that we want."

Who can ever tell how near Boulanger came to making his *coup d'état*, universal suffrage standing ready to put him in power —the common people and the upper classes uniting for this purpose, it is to be noted, just as they did on December 2nd, 1851?

How can we reconcile this persistent "need of a man," a longing so decidedly anti-republican, which showed itself again, after the terrible lesson of 1870, as full of life and as obstinate as in 1851—how can we reconcile it, I ask, with the instinctive horror of monarchy which universal suffrage accentuates more and more every time it is called upon to express an opinion on the subject? It is both anti-monarchical and un-republican at one and the same time. And yet our French Republic of to-day appears so solid, on account of the stand taken by universal suffrage, that the partisans of Monarchy have finally disbanded and are now debating whether or no to accept the Republic. This is an appparent anomaly which, however, is easily explained.

French society of to-day dates from the Revolution of 1789. It replaced, as every body knows, the old regime. Now the Revolution put an end to three features of the old regime,—its three fundamental principles. It killed Monarchy by proclaiming national sovereignty. It killed the nobility by

proclaiming the abolition of privileges. It killed the spiritual domination of the clergy by proclaiming the enfranchisement of conscience and of reason. These three principles died together, but as social institutions never yield without a long and determined struggle for life, we are still witnessing to-day the moribund efforts of the old regime.

It was only natural that the Republic, especially the Republic of universal suffrage, should succeed this complete falling to pieces of the old regime. National sovereignty and the Republic are the same thing. Equality in the sovereignty is a *sine qua non* in a nation where all men are declared to be equal. Prepared or unprepared for such a change, the people of the Revolution found themselves forced to accept the Republic for all time, even when it should be discovered, during moments of weakness, to be a rather heavy burden to bear.

Our Third Republic is in reality simply the revival of the First Republic, twice overthrown by the two Napoleons with the acclamations, alas! of the French people. It is painful to me to have to make such a confession, especially to foreign readers. But why shut one's eyes to so evident a fact? One must be just, however, at the same time. How could it have been otherwise? How could a people, trained for centuries to passive obedience, be made ready at a moment's notice for the republican form of government, and how could universal suffrage be other than a dangerous instrument in their hands? A republic of universal suffrage requires, in order to prosper, that the nation be composed of real citizens, men who look upon public affairs as their own affairs, who understand them, guard them each on his own account, and who believe in the solidarity of citizenship: one for all, all for one. This is, I admit, an ideal polity. But if its complete realization be a chimera, there is an absolute necessity that this ideal be realized up to a certain point, if civil government is to succeed in a democracy. It exists in a state of sufferance or falls into entire disuse according as the surrounding conditions are more or less favorable to its development. When you see the ignorant and indifferent shirk their duty to the commonwealth you may always lay the blame on the instinct of self-preservation.

But—and this is the true explanation of this situation in France—neither during the Boulanger episode, nor on the 18th

Brumaire, nor on December 2nd, 1851, did these ignorant and indifferent citizens have the slightest idea of yielding up the benefits bestowed by the Revolution, which are much more precious in their eyes than is the Republic. So when, feeling unequal to the task of governing themselves, they have had recourse to a master, they have always been very careful not to seek him among the followers of the old regime. Their man could not be and never has been other than a representative of the Revolution. Monarchy is a word that sounds badly to their ears. To them it means a body of privileged nobles and domineering priests. Its partisans may give out that they accept the Republic. But this is not enough ; they must lift their hats to the Revolution if they hope to get into the good graces of universal suffrage. Cæsarism, Revolutionary Cæsarism, is the demon ever ready to pounce on the France of universal suffrage. But the future pretender, if one is in store for us, is still in the background whence suddenly issued his predecessor a few years ago. Like Boulanger he will be pushed rapidly to the front by personal ambition and by a combination of circumstances that cannot be predicted. He has yet no party behind him, because he has not made himself known. No, I am mistaken. He has a party, a powerful party, even now ready to aid him when he appears on the scene, each prepared to help and be benefited by the other. A word about this party.

Let us examine carefully the evolution which Rome is forcing at this moment on the French clergy. Hidden behind the pretended accepting of the Third Republic, by which nobody is duped—the Pope is too shrewd to have expected that it would be otherwise—stands a grave fact, much graver than it appears at first sight, viz., the official abandonment by the Church of the monarchical party with which it has lived on the best of terms ever since 1870. This sudden and peremptory order of Leo XIII. to the faithful to break with that party is a very bitter pill for our bishops, who have had recourse so often to the long purses of the nobility, and for our priests who have always had their place at table in the chateaux of the aristocracy. They do not obey without grumbling, though they do bow to this formal injunction, coming as it does from the head of the Church who has evidently fully decided on the course he means to pursue. Leo XIII., like a

careful pilot, has thrown overboard the cumbersome cargo of French monarchy and is now free to steer his ecclesiastical bark where he will. He has boldly determined to abandon to their unfortunate fate old allies whom he has at last found more compromising than useful. And this brings us to the core of this subject of the history of universal suffrage in France.

Of the three dethroned powers of the old regime, the clergy is the only one which still exercises any political influence; and it owes this influence to universal suffrage. Under Louis Philippe, as I very well remember, the political rôle of the clergy was almost null. There was this one good thing about his two-hundred-franc citizens,—the Church had a very slight hold on them as far as political matters were concerned. They were generally too Voltairian and too independent to receive ballots from the hands of their priests. But the accident of February 24th, 1848—the flood of voters which it spread over France—suddenly transformed this ecclesiastical army into a vast political machine, acting alike simultaneously throughout the whole country. The Church, which a moment before played so small a part in the plans of the politicians, became in a day a mighty engine with which everybody had to count. The friends of General Cavaignac, the Republican candidate for the Presidency during the Second Republic, hoped to bring the clergy over to their side by sending a French fleet to the aid of the Pope who had been chased from his dominions by his indignant subjects. This action led later to the French occupation of Rome, a ball and chain which France had to drag about with her during the Second Empire. It appears that Louis Napoleon promised more than Cavaignac, or at least that the Church expected more from him; for, a week before the election, the clergy, who were up to that time laboring in the interest of the General, suddenly received orders to change front. I was an eye-witness to this fact in our eastern Departments. And, indeed, these ecclesiastics were richly rewarded by him for this valuable support; for, as long as Napoleon sat on the throne, they were masters and did as they liked.

When, in 1870, the Empire fell, the clergy threw themselves, body and soul into the reactionary struggle of the monarchists against the establishment of the Third Republic. Unfortunately for these pious politicians they found themselves in compromising company, and laid themselves open to attack. Universal suf-

frage, which, during the eighteen years of Louis Napoleon, had submissively accepted their rule, now rebelled when the country seemed threatened with a "government of priests," as Gambetta called it, and so they failed in their bold attempt to secure again the upper hand.

The persistent clergy were offered another chance to regain their lost power when the country went almost mad over Boulanger. The Church quickly resumed its old post, as in 1848, behind the popular idol. Supported by Rochefort, Laguerre and Naquet, General Boulanger was an excellent screen for concealing the ecclesiastical wire-pullers, and if he had carried the day he would have found himself a more complete prisoner of the Church than was Napoleon III., because he would not have had the glory of a great name to give him personal prestige. Fate happily decided that this should not be. But the same thing will happen again when another Cæsar appears in the field, and the game will be played all the more easily this time because the tie is now broken which bound together church and monarchy.

Thus have things gone in our country since public affairs were placed in the hands of universal suffrage. Will they continue to go on in this way? This is a very difficult question to answer, complicated as it is by discordant elements. The French people, taken as a whole, are not yet republican. The nation is forced to accept the Republic; it is forced to do so by the Revolution which it will not abandon at any price. Universal suffrage was a danger to the country from the very first, and is so still. But nobody dares attempt to remove the evil because it is the final and natural outcome of the Revolution which is inviolable. It would be difficult to find a country in a more illogical situation. But, in spite of this predicament, France advances with a light step in the path of human progress. Its people live peacefully and grow richer day by day, toiling on impassively while forms of government succeed one another, causing only a ripple on the surface. It enjoys the passing hour, and has confidence in the future without, however, being able to heal the sore in its side.

Is there a more difficult problem to solve than that of the life of nations?

JEAN MACE.

FOREIGN NATIONS AT THE WORLD'S FAIR.

JAPAN, BY HIS EXCELLENCY, THE JAPANESE MINISTER AT WASHINGTON, GOZO TATENO; ITALY, BY AUGUSTUS O. BOURN, CONSUL-GENERAL AT ROME.

I.--JAPAN.

THE interest in the World's Columbian Exposition which foreign nations have so generally shown is cordially shared in Japan. Other countries have more extensive commercial relations with the United States, and all European nations are more closely identified with the historical event which the Exposition is designed to commemorate, but none, I may venture to say, will join more heartily than Japan in the endeavor to make the undertaking a success.

The importance of the Exposition itself and the magnificent scale upon which it has been planned, would naturally excite feelings of this kind, but, apart from this, there is another sentiment involved which causes the Japanese Government and the Japanese people to look with especial friendliness upon such an enterprise when inaugurated by the United States.

From one point of view international Expositions may be regarded as a growth of modern civilization, designed, in part at least, to bring the nations of the earth into closer communion with each other. Their purely utilitarian uses may overshadow this fundamental purpose, but the fact remains that the promotion of commercial intercourse and the enhancement of mercantile profits are not their only, or their most important, object.

To the Japanese people, in their present condition, this is the view which naturally suggests itself first. We think that the enlargement of old, and the opening of new channels of trade are to be desired, but we deem it even more desirable that the world should gain a more accurate and comprehensive knowledge of our

country, its history, its progress, and its aspirations. Any occasion, therefore, which will bring Japan into closer touch with other nations is welcome to us, and most of all so when the opportunity is offered by a country whose government and people have always displayed a sincere and kindly interest in our welfare.

Japan is by no means a novice as regards international Expositions. We have participated—I think I may say with credit—in every important Exposition which has been held during the past twenty years. We have had, besides, several Expositions of our own, national, it is true, and therefore limited in scope, but not devoid of notably beneficial results. Japan will consequently participate in the Columbian Exposition with an accurate knowledge of the advantages which should accrue to her people from this opportunity to show to the world their true condition, social and political, as well as the manner in which they are maintaining the reputation they have gained in certain branches of art and industry.

As I have already intimated, apart from any benefit to themselves, my countrymen will take peculiar pleasure in adding, however little it may be, to the success of an enterprise in which the United States is so deeply interested. It might perhaps be out of place for me to dwell too minutely upon this branch of the subject, but I violate no confidence when I speak of the appreciation which Japan entertains for the friendship uniformly shown to her by the United States. The notable manifestations of that friendship are a part of current history; they have created in the minds of the Japanese people a feeling of confidence and esteem which will gladly find expression on every suitable occasion.

The unique experience through which Japan has passed during the past thirty years is known to all. But the trials to which she has been subjected, and the obstacles she has had to overcome in the path of progress she has chosen for herself, are not so generally understood or appreciated. Casual observers are inclined to regard the picturesque rather than the practical side of her history.

The experience of a nation suddenly emerging from the isolation of centuries into the noonday glare of the nineteenth century undoubtedly presents picturesque features. To a people so situated, however, ambitious and self-respecting, not ashamed of

their ancient civilization, but eager to secure the benefits of modern progress, and, above all, determined to maintain their national prestige, the situation is one of stern reality. They cannot live in the past, and, if they have a high ideal, they must perform in decades what it has taken other nations centuries to accomplish.

Such was the task which the circumstances of her situation forced upon Japan, and it may be said without boastfulness that she has thus far attained a measure of success in its performance of which she has no reason to be ashamed. Her path has not always been an easy or a pleasant one, but she has been fortunate in many things, in none more so than in the friendship of her powerful neighbor, the United States, who was the first to bring her into intimate intercourse with other nations, and who has never been unmindful of her aspirations or heedless of her rights.

The manner in which the Japanese Government and people manifested their desire to participate in the Columbian Exposition affords a practical illustration of the sentiment of gratitude which the considerate policy of the United States has aroused. The question was first brought into public notice in March, 1890. The Imperial Diet was then holding its first session, the initial essay of the Empire in parliamentary government. There had been friction between the legislative and executive branches of the Government, as was but natural at the outset of a change of such momentous importance.

The Diet's powers as regards the National Budget are considerable, and there had been a determined effort to curtail the public expenditures. Under the circumstances, no suggestion was less likely to meet with approval than the proposal to expend a large sum of money in an entirely new direction. Yet it was while these conditions prevailed that the Diet voluntarily proposed to the Cabinet that provision should be made for Japan's participation in the Columbian Exposition. The proposal was accompanied by an intimation that the Diet was prepared to immediately appropriate whatever sum might be necessary for the purpose.

The proposal was cordially welcomed by the executive branch of the Government, for it was evident that whatever differences of opinion there might be concerning questions of domestic policy, all parties were agreed upon this subject. Nor can there be any doubt as regards the specific ground upon which this una-

nimity of opinion rested. Every Japanese, whether in public or private station, naturally desired that Japan should be worthily represented at the World's Fair. But sentiments of self-respect and self-interest apart, there was an evident consensus of opinion that this was a suitable opportunity for the manifestation of the high estimation in which Japan holds her relations with the United States. This was the sentiment expressed by the Ministry, by the Diet, and in the public press.

When the proposal was made, in March, 1890, to appropriate the amount necessary to defray the expenses of participating in the Exposition, the official invitation of the United States had just been received, and there was not time, before the adjournment of the Diet, to submit an estimate of the amount which would be required. At the beginning of the next session, however, in November of the same year, a supplementary budget providing for the expenditure of six hundred and thirty thousand yen, or about half a million dollars, was submitted to the Diet, and was passed by both Houses by a practically unanimous vote.

On the 5th of June, 1891, His Majesty the Emperor appointed a commission to take charge of the preparations for Japan's exhibit in the Exposition. It consisted of a President, Vice-President, and five Commissioners, the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce being designated to act *ex-officio* as President, and the other members being gentlemen whose technical knowledge and previous experience fit them for the intelligent discharge of the duties intrusted to the Commission.

By the Imperial decree constituting the Commission an Advisory Council was appointed to assist in preparing the exhibit. In all previous international Expositions the Government has retained exclusive control. The appointment of this Council, which includes among its members a number of manufacturers and merchants. may therefore be regarded as an important departure, especially significant in its recognition of the extent of the popular interest in Japan regarding the Exposition.

In adopting a general plan of action the Commission resolved that the exhibit of Japan, while comprehensive, should be a thoroughly accurate and typical representation of the arts, manufactures, industries, and commerce of the Empire. There is a natural tendency in such enterprises to make the best possible showing, especially as regards industrial and commercial exhibits—to

exhibit goods a little superior in quality. and to affix prices a little lower in amount than the exact market average. The Commission accordingly notified intending exhibitors that they did not wish the exhibits in these classes to be different in any respect from similar articles designed only for domestic use. On the contrary, they desired that the industrial and commercial portion of Japan's exhibit should be nothing more than a truthful reflex of the conditions prevailing in Japan.

The Commission naturally advised a different course in relation to the products of artistic skill. Here the object is to show the best that can be produced, and, on that account, exhibitors were informed that no effort should be spared to prove that Japanese artists retain the reputation they have earned in certain branches of art.

As preparations for the Exposition progressed, it became apparent that the labors of the Commission would be facilitated by the systematic concentration of the work in different parts of the Empire. Local commissions were accordingly appointed in each prefecture, consisting of the governor, local officials, merchants and manufacturers. These commissions were directed to deal with all matters relating to exhibits from their several districts, and to report all essential details to the central Commission.

Notification was also given of the assistance which the Government intends to extend to exhibitors, which includes freight and insurance upon exhibits from the point of shipment to Chicago and return; expenses incurred for storage and insurance in the United States prior to the opening of the Exposition; insurance during the Exposition, and incidental expenses, such as the cost of shelves, showcases, etc. It is safe to assume that no country has undertaken to do more in this respect than Japan.

When the task of preparing for the Exposition was commenced, it was roughly estimated that the weight of the exhibits would amount to one thousand tons, which would have been nearly three times that of the Japanese exhibits sent to Philadelphia in 1876, and to Paris in 1889. But when the catalogues of proposed exhibits were received from the local commissions it was found that they would exceed seven thousand tons weight. The space allotted to Japan in the Exposition and the sum appropriated for expenses

were obviously inadequate for an exhibit of this size, and it became necessary to curtail it in some way. By a system of strict examination, and by the choice of only the best and the most characteristic specimens, the Commission finally succeeded in reducing the weight of the exhibits to about seventeen hundred and fifty tons.

Towards the end of 1891 the Imperial Government sent Commissioner Tejima to the United States for the purpose of making arrangements with the Exposition management in regard to the space to be set apart for Japan in the grounds and buildings. As a result of the agreement arrived at the following allotments of space were made to Japan:

On Wooded Island, in Jackson Park, 40,000 square feet for the exhibition of historical architecture; in the Building of Manufactures and Liberal Arts, 40,000 square feet; in the Building of Agriculture, 3,500 square feet; in the Palace of Fine Arts, 2,850 square feet; in the Horticultural Building, 4,000 square feet; in the Building of Forestry, 950 square feet; in the Building of Mines and Mining, 1,800 square feet; in the Building of Fish and Fisheries, 1,400 square feet; in the Midway Plaisance, 50,000 square feet for a bazaar, and 4,000 square feet for a tea house.

The buildings on Wooded Island are unique in design and construction. They are intended to illustrate three different epochs of Japanese architecture, and will be known as the Hō-ōden, or "Phœnix Palace." They will consist of three separate buildings, connected by wide corridors, and so arranged as to possess an air of general architectural unity. The left wing is in the style of the Ashikaga period (about A. D. 1400). The right wing is modelled upon the architecture in vogue during the most prosperous period of the Fujiwara supremacy (about A. D. 1200), while the main hall follows in design the architecture most common at the time when the Tokugawa family had reached the height of its power (about A. D. 1700).

The general ground plan of the buildings is similar to that of one of the most famous historical temples in Japan, the Hō-ōdo (Phœnix Temple) built in the village of Uji eight hundred and forty-two years ago. An effort will be made to have these buildings conform in every detail of construction and ornamentation to their historical models. The interior decoration has been undertaken by the Tokio Art School, and the furniture and works

of art in each building will be selected by the authorities of the Imperial Museum, and will be typical of the different periods to which the buildings, respectively, belong.

It is also proposed to lay out the grounds about the Hō-ōden upon the model of the gardens of the castles of the Daimios, the former territorial nobles of Japan. For this purpose gardeners have been brought from Japan, and have already begun work. Japanese trees and shrubs will be imported, and it is hoped that when the garden is completed it will be a fair sample of the landscape gardening which has been so much admired by visitors to Japan.

The Hō-ōden has been presented to the city of Chicago, and will pass under its control at the close of the Exposition.

The principal exhibits of Japan at the Exposition will be silk, silk fabrics, lacquer, porcelain, bronze, wood carvings, bamboo work, articles made of leather, tea, rice, fish, mineral products, and educational apparatus.

The articles which in Japan it is usual to include under the designation of "fine arts" differ in some respects from the category recognized in the West. The exhibits under that head in the Exposition will, of course, conform to the classification adopted in Japan. They will include gold lacquer, cloisonné, bronzes, paintings, carvings, embroidery, and that kind of painting upon silk and velvet peculiar to Japan, and known as "Yuzen." Inspectors have been appointed in the office of the Commission at Tokio, whose duty it is to closely examine every article offered for exhibition under this classification, and to accept only the best and most truly representative specimens of Japanese art.

The Commission has devoted much time and study to the arrangement and ornamentation of the Japanese sections in the Exposition. They desire to reproduce, as nearly as is possible, the appearance of Japanese environment for the Japanese exhibits. For example, just at the entrance to the Japanese section in the Building of Manufactures and Liberal Arts, a gate will be erected such as is found before all Japanese buildings of any pretension. This gate with its graceful curved roof, supported by four pillars, and with the watchmen's lodges at either side, will be an interesting example of one of the most characteristic types in Japanese architecture. Other gates of simpler design will be placed at the

side of the section. The walls of the Japanese section in the Fine Arts Building will also be constructed and ornamented in a distinctively Japanese style.

A large Japanese building will be erected in the Exposition grounds near Wooded Island by the Tea Merchants' Guild of Japan. The enterprise is a private one, but its promoters do not expect to derive any profit from it. Their object is to familiarize the American public with the best varieties of Japanese tea, and with Japanese methods of preparing it. Several rooms in the building will be especially constructed for the *cha-no-yu*, an ancient tea drinking ceremonial which once ranked as a cult in Japan.

The Japanese bazaar is also a private enterprise, a number of Japanese merchants and manufacturers having formed an association and obtained permission to establish a bazaar in the Exposition grounds. The shops will be built in the Japanese fashion, and an extensive variety of Japanese goods will be offered for sale. The preparations for this enterprise have been made upon a scale which warrants the belief that the display will be very attractive.

When it became known that a women's section had been established in the Exposition a number of Japanese ladies combined to prepare exhibits illustrative of the condition and avocations of Japanese women. Their Majesties the Empress and the Empress Dowager displayed warm interest in the undertaking, and contributed generously to its successful prosecution.

The Association appointed a committee of nineteen to have charge of the work of preparation, which has been carried on industriously and systematically. The space allotted to the Japanese section in the Women's Building at Chicago is necessarily limited, so that the committee has been obliged to exercise the greatest care in choosing specimens of the arts and handicrafts in which Japanese women engage. These include painting, engraving, lace-making, embroidery, the manufacture of porcelain, cloisonné, lacquer, textile fabrics, and the preparation of raw silk. There will be several exhibits from the silk manufactory in the Aoyama Palace, which is under the patronage of Her Majesty the Empress Dowager, and which is conducted entirely by women.

It is the purpose of the Ladies' Association to reproduce within the space at their disposal three fac-similes of the rooms occupied

by noble Japanese ladies in feudal times. All the furniture and fittings will be in keeping, the former having been loaned by ladies belonging to families in which the articles to be loaned have been kept as heirlooms.

With a view to explaining the social and economic status of Japanese women, a book and a statistical pamphlet will be published in the English language, under the auspices of the Ladies' Association. The pamphlet will give, in tabulated form, the statistics of female education and employment, and of philanthropic and charitable enterprises under female supervision. The book will be, as far as possible, a complete review of the position held by women in Japan, their domestic and public status, their religious and educational training, their lives as daughters, wives, and mothers, and their employment in the various arts and industries.

It should be added that the work of the Ladies' Association is independent of Government control, and has been inaugurated, and is being carried on, entirely by themselves.

The foregoing is a necessarily incomplete review of the share which Japan intends to take in the World's Columbian Exposition. Other matters of interest might be mentioned, if the space at command permitted, but I trust I have said enough to show the deep interest which my Government and my countrymen take in the subject, and their determination to make their part of the Exposition a credit to themselves and a tribute worthy of the regard which they entertain for the United States. That they anticipate the happiest results from their efforts in this direction may be taken as a matter of course. They know that they may reasonably hope to show the world that Japan is a country of rich and varied resources, whose people have not lost their love of beauty or their skill in reproducing it in manifold artistic forms; and whose soil and mines and waters produce an abundance of staples for the creation and continuance of a prosperous commerce. But, above all, they hope that what they will do on this occasion will bring them into closer contact with intelligent, thinking people, and will prove that Japan is a country worthy of full fellowship in the family of nations, no longer deserving to labor under the incubus which circumstances forced upon her.

Without challenging the rightfulness of the restrictions which

were imposed upon them when their first treaties were made, the Japanese people feel that the necessity for those restrictions has entirely passed away. The burden which still remains may seem light to others; to them it is an ever-present reminder of the fact that all they have accomplished is incomplete so long as this unnecessary, incumbering vestige of the past remains. Therefore, it is just that they welcome the Columbian Exposition as one means of proving that they have attained a position worthy of the respect and confidence of other nations.

GOZO TATENO.

II.—ITALY.

ALTHOUGH the political events of the past year have brought Italy prominently to the attention of our people, it does not seem to be generally known that our commercial relations with her are more important than with any other European nation except Great Britain, Germany and France.

That these relations are not still more extensive, is to a great extent our own fault. for the Italians not only believe that whatever comes from America is the best that can be produced, but they are perfectly willing to pay us our prices for many of our manufactures that now only reach them through other nations at such an increased cost as to almost prohibit their purchase. On the other hand they thoroughly appreciate the fact that our market is the largest and best in the world, and they are anxious to seize every opportunity to increase their sales to us.

It is therefore very pertinent to ask: What are the possibilities in the way of an exhibit from Italy at the coming Exposition at Chicago, and what will she send us to illustrate her resources?

Italy can divide with Spain the glory of having furnished the central figure in whose honor the Exposition is to be held. The latter provided Columbus with the means for the voyage of discovery, but Italy was the land of his birth, the home of his boyhood and youth, and inspired him with that spirit of adventure which resulted in the discovery of America. No details can be sent of the place of his birth, but elaborate descriptions and photographs of the house in Genoa in which he passed his boyhood and youth have long since been sent to the managers of the Exposition.

Upon the first announcement of the intended celebration the Italians entered most heartily into the spirit of the project and extensive arrangements were made for the preparation of suitable exhibits. But, as a good proportion of those intending to exhibit cannot do so, owing to the very limited space allotted to Italy, especially in the Fine Arts Department, their ardor has been somewhat dampened. There is no doubt, however, that the small space allotted will be fully and worthily occupied.

The Commissioners who visited Italy last winter were cordially received. They were granted interviews with the King and Queen, and also with the Pope. The Queen partially promised to loan her collection of old laces, which is said to be the finest in the world, and the Pope promised to send a collection from the treasures of the Vatican, to show the interest he took in the success of the undertaking. The Commissioners were also present at several meetings of the most prominent artists of Rome and Florence, and visited the chief manufacturing centres, receiving everywhere assurances of cordial support.

The Government has shown a disposition to coöperate in every possible way to assist exhibitors. Under its direction a central committee has been formed in Rome, with Monteverde, the eminent sculptor, as President, and with auxiliaries in all the chief cities of the kingdom to superintend the collection and forwarding of exhibits. A government transport will convey to New York, free of charge, everything intended for the Exposition. No money, however, had been appropriated to pay the expenses of exhibitors when I left Rome, in August, but the subject was then under favorable consideration.

If those remains of Roman magnificence that attract hundreds of thousands of visitors from every quarter of the world could be bodily transported to the exhibition grounds, or could be faithfully reproduced there in perishable plaster; if we could select from Italy's stores of sculpture and paintings and from her museums of art as we would like, there would be at Chicago such a collection of both ancient and modern works of art as the world has never seen. But it is highly improbable that even a small representation of Italy's ancient remains will be attempted, or that she will intrust to the dangers of an ocean voyage many of her gems of art. For we must not forget that these are among her chief resources, and that to see them visitors from other lands

spend in Italy upwards of one hundred millions of dollars every year. We may look, however, to her artists of to-day for a representation of which any nation might well be proud.

I do not know whether our American artists living in Italy will send their works to the Italian section or not, but if they should, the city of Rome alone could furnish an exhibition of sculpture that neither Italy nor the United States would be ashamed to compare with the collection of any other nation. If Simmons could send a reproduction of his masterpiece, the soldiers' monument at Portland, Me., or those graceful ideals in marble, "Penelope," "the Mother of Moses," or "the Young Medusa"; if Ezekiel could send his magnificent bronze statue of Columbus that is now being cast for Furber's Columbian Building at Chicago, or some of his wonderful portraits in marble; if Greenough, who has long been so favorably known in the United States, could send some of his favorite works in bronze; if Story, the elder, could send some of his well-known works, for which he has gained so great a reputation; if Story, the younger, could send some of the exquisite bas-reliefs that he has recently finished; if we could have a worthy representation of the works of Harnish, who made the Calhoun monument for Charleston, S. C., or of Miss Varney and Miss Hosmer, who are excelled by no other women as sculptors—all of these would worthily supplant the productions of those well-known Roman sculptors who are expected to contribute examples of their work. I must not, however, omit to mention Vedder, or Hazeltine, or Coleman, who maintain with honor the reputation of America, and whose pictures draw throngs of our travelling citizens to their studios.

Italy is essentially an agricultural country, nearly seventy per cent. of her population being directly engaged in agriculture. She is not only practically independent of the rest of the world for her food supply, but her exports are chiefly the product of her soil. These also would, therefore, naturally constitute a representation of her chief resources. Her crops of wheat, corn, rye, barley, oats, and rice are of excellent quality and generally sufficient for her wants, while the olive oil from Lucca is equal to any the world can produce. Wine is abundantly produced in every section, and when well prepared is of excellent quality. In former years, before the disastrous rupture of Italy's reciprocity treaty

with France, a large part of her wines found their way to this country among the best brands of Bordeaux clarets.

She also produces chestnuts, which, with corn and macaroni, are the chief articles of food consumed by the people; hemp, from Bologna, of such fineness and lustre as almost to resemble silk; cocoons and raw silk, which the patient and industrious peasants are so well fitted to raise; flax of excellent quality, which is chiefly spun and woven at home for domestic purposes—for in Italy linen is universally used instead of cotton, and the farmers' wives could display stocks of snowy linen that would excite the envy of any American woman.

Italy exports very largely of oranges and lemons, sulphur, and argol, or crude cream of tartar,—and the bulk of all these is taken by the United States. We also take largely of her cheese, candied citrons, essences, glycerine, gloves and soap, almonds, filberts, pistachio nuts, hazel nuts and walnuts. Her orchards produce apples, pears, figs, peaches, apricots, nectarines, olives and pomegranates. Potatoes and vegetables of every description are universally grown, and in the South the sugar cane and cotton plant flourish. There are also mines of zinc, lead, iron, copper, gold, silver, quicksilver, antimony, alum and coal.

In 1891 nearly 120,000 tons of iron ore were shipped to the United States from the single port of Leghorn. The zinc ore is shipped chiefly to Belgium, whence much of it finds its way to the United States as the best Belgian zinc. The marble quarries of Carrara have been famous from the earliest times and still produce the finest statuary marble to be found in the world. At San Valentino, near Ancona, there are mines of bitumen which is said to be stronger and more durable than the best Trinidad asphalt. At Cagliari, in Sardinia, there are salt-works which have a capacity of about one thousand tons a day.

But it by no means follows that the exhibits from Italy will be confined to sculpture, paintings and the products of the soil. The bulk of her manufactures, it is true, are household industries which never appear prominently to the outside observer. She has her manufactories of cotton, woollen and linen goods, besides iron foundries and ship-yards where there have been built and armed the largest vessels of war in existence. It is, however, in the department of artistic manufactures that we may expect a most interesting exhibit.

Salviati of Venice will establish in the Exposition Buildings a branch of his celebrated manufactory of Venetian glass-ware and mosaics, and other well-known manufacturers will contribute examples of their best products. We shall thus have at Chicago, without doubt, a much finer collection of art examples in that wonderful Venetian glass, which the rest of the world has heretofore failed to imitate, than can be found even in Venice itself—mirrors, chandeliers, table services, and designs for every conceivable purpose of ornament, in variety and richness almost to dazzle the imagination—and mosaics, not small articles of jewelry, but large, elaborate, and elegant pictures. It is not at all improbable that, if sufficient encouragement be given, one or more of these manufacturers may permanently establish themselves in the United States, and thus another new branch of industry be added to our list.

There will also be Florentine mosaics from Florence. One who has formed his conceptions of these mosaics from the small articles that occasionally find their way to our country can have no idea of the elaborate designs which can be wrought by the skilful Florentine artists from the hard pebbles picked up in riverbeds. I have seen at Florence table-tops of wonderful beauty that it had required years of continuous labor to execute.

There will be sent from Venice samples of most exquisite laces; from Florence, Siena and Venice artistically carved furniture; and from Milan furniture inlaid with ivory, in addition to silks, velvets and brocades. From Tuscany we shall have, in almost endless variety contributions of the celebrated Florentine straw braids and manufactures. And then there will be in great variety majolicas, which doubtless are produced in Italy in the greatest perfection. If Genori, who has done so much to restore the ancient fame of Italian porcelain and pottery, should exhibit but a small part of what I have seen in the show rooms of his manufactory near Florence, it would be one of the most attractive corners of the Exposition.

And then there will be bronzes, less elaborate perhaps than the French, but of purer classical designs; also tapestries, arms, armor, stuffs, and other antiquities. We may also expect worthy specimens in stucco working and fresco paintings, in which the Italians easily surpass other nations.

AUGUSTUS O. BOURN.

POSSIBILITIES OF THE TELESCOPE.

BY ALVAN G. CLARK.

WHAT the telescope of the future can do, may be partly learned from a comparative survey of its past history and progress. When Galileo in the early part of the seventeenth century showed his first telescope, which magnified only three diameters, to the astonished authorities of Venice, little did they dream of the possibility of the Lick refractor of to-day.

Galileo's first instrument was similar in construction to the ordinary opera glass. It was no more powerful, and was far less perfect. In fact, it consisted merely of two single lenses, one being convex and the other concave. Even his last and best telescope, magnifying thirty diameters, was much inferior to some of our spy-glasses. But even with this small instrumental equipment a new world was unveiled. He saw the spots on the sun, the phases of Venus, the mountains of the moon, the satellites of Jupiter, the rings of Saturn, and thrust back the barriers of the stellar world.

It may be remarked that there are two general classes of telescopes, the refracting and the reflecting. Much success has been attained by the Herschels, Lassell and others in the construction of reflecting telescopes, but as the refractor has proved itself the superior and as its possibilities for the future are, in my opinion, much greater, I shall confine myself principally to that.

The refracting telescope is composed of two principal parts, the object glass and the eye glass. The object glass has a general convexity of form, and its purpose is to collect light from the object and bring it to a focus near the eye glass, where it forms a bright image. The eye glass, in its turn, magnifies this image and renders it visible to the eye on an enlarged scale. But in order to enlarge the image we must collect considerable light, and

the more we magnify or spread out this image the more light we must collect to render it visible, and consequently the greater object glass, or light collector, we must have. Hence it was that simultaneously with the first telescopes arose the desire to get more light in order to obtain a greater magnification.

Two difficulties, however, presented themselves; first, that a single convex lens will not accurately converge all the rays of light to the same focus, and, second, that a single lens, acting as a prism, disperses the rays, thus giving a series of overlapping images of different colors. The first is called spherical and the last chromatic aberration.

In order to increase the power of the early telescopes, recourse was had to larger single lenses of great focal length; but this only partly obviated the difficulty, and it rendered them very unwieldy. About 1758 Dollond found that if the object glass was composed of two lenses of different kinds of glass, and of the proper form, instead of one, both aberrations could be corrected. It is by this principle that the modern achromatic telescope has been made possible.

But the main question of this article is: What are the future possibilities of the telescope, and what is the limit to its size; also, what will the great telescopes of the future do? We answer that there is practically no limit to its size, the reason for our answer being contained partly in what has already been said, and partly in what will follow.

For centuries men studied the heavens more or less successfully without the aid of telescopes. Gradually, however, the standard of observation was raised, but with the invention of the telescope a tremendous advance was made. Hitherto, men's observations were confined to the limits of ordinary vision. Not a single observation could be obtained beyond it. With the advent of the telescope, however, the horizon of knowledge was greatly enlarged even at the outset. Then came the desire for greater power, and to obviate the difficulty in the single lens system, long unwieldy instruments were constructed. Still farther advances were made possible by the invention and use of the double achromatic lens, by means of which the aberrations could be corrected and the telescope reduced in length to a convenient size. Then, another difficulty presented itself, to procure discs of glass which would be free from veins and striae, and at

the same time homogeneous. Even towards the close of the last century it was impossible to secure suitable pieces of glass of more than six or seven inches in diameter, and these were often of a very inferior quality.

When, in 1825, the Dorpat refractor of nine and a half inches aperture was constructed, it was considered a masterpiece, and it was thought the limit had been reached. Guinand, however, had made better glass possible, and Fraunhofer better workmanship. As a consequence, there were constructed in 1845 two object glasses of fifteen inches aperture. But this limit was again surpassed when we succeeded in procuring discs for an eighteen and three-quarter inch glass, which were figured and sent to Chicago. Then followed the twenty-six inch lenses of the Washington and McCormick observatories, the thirty inch lens of the Pulkowa, and, finally, the great thirty-six inch lens of the Lick observatory.

It must be remembered that the ground had been disputed inch by inch, and that with each succeeding advance the limit of successful glass melting was thought to have been attained. Even quite recently a noted optician, speaking of the possibility of obtaining discs larger than thirty-six inches, said it appeared to him that the chances of obtaining forty inch discs in the present state of the art were remote. And yet there are now in my manufactory two remarkably fine discs of forty inches diameter ready for figuring. Who then shall set the limit to this phase of the art, considering the great possibilities of scientific improvement and advance of the present day, in view of what has been already accomplished?

But some one will ask: "How about giving a correct figure to such enormous lenses?" When one considers that all the rays of light passing through these great lenses must be brought to a focal point which a thread would far more than cover, and that the aberrations must be corrected at the same time, this question is not inapt. But I venture to say that by my method of local correction, lenses of any size can be figured and brought into shape with comparative ease. I do not mean to assert that the undertaking is not a great one, but it will, nevertheless, be crowned with success.

This method of local correction consists, in general terms, in first finding the defects of a lens by frequent optical tests during the process of figuring, and then eliminating them without intro-

ducing others, by work at those points, the finest and most delicate work being done with the fingers. In this way a lens can be corrected wherever it becomes necessary, until absolute perfection is given to the image, and it is only by this method that I have been able to secure uniformly good results. With the monster telescopes of the present and future, however, the workmanship must, if possible, be even more critical, for, from the great size of the lenses any inherent difficulty will be still more aggravated. It may be, however, that the glass is not uniformly homogeneous, and that there is a slight increase in density over a small area of its surface. In this case by the method I have advocated, an excess of polishing and abrasion may be used at this point, the lens slightly flattened, and a perfect image secured. By this means the optician can render himself to a certain extent independent of the skill of the glass manufacturer, and a great disc with even a slight imperfection could be made to give a perfect result.

A question sometimes asked is: "Will not a great increase in the size of lenses necessitate so much increase in thickness that a large amount of light will be lost by absorption?" In reply, I would say, that we are a long way from experiencing anything very serious in this respect. The forty inch discs, already mentioned, have only a combined thickness of some four inches, and the lenses of an object glass of even six feet aperture would necessitate a combined thickness of not more than six inches. To be sure this increased thickness means some more absorption, but not to the extent that some suppose, especially with the best glass now obtainable.

An experiment made at my manufactory will perhaps best illustrate just what I mean. I took a block of dense flint glass nine inches thick and polished on both edges. Behind this was placed common newspaper print, while in front of it sat a party who ordinarily, although not invariably, used glasses in reading. Through this nine inches of dense glass, however, he was able with perfect ease to read the whole newspaper article by lamplight, and without optical aid. But this nine inches in thickness is, as I have already said, much more than is necessary for even a six foot lens, and who knows how soon still more transparent glass may be at hand, considering the steady improvement made in this line, and the fact that the present discs are infinitely superior to the early ones.

But even supposing a slightly larger per cent. of light is lost by absorption per unit of surface in a six foot lens than in a three foot one, yet the area of the larger will be four times that of the smaller, so that the total amount of light must be vastly greater.

Besides, every one who has had experience in using telescopes knows, that even if two instruments of quite different sizes can both see the same object without trouble, the larger one has a decided advantage from the greater amount of light and the consequent increased ease and facility of seeing, which enables us to do better work. In illustration of the great light-collecting power of a large telescope, I may cite the fact that with the thirty-six inch refractor, eighteen nebulæ were discovered at the Lick observatory in a space only 16′ by 5′.5, and, more recently, a fifth satellite has been added to the planet Jupiter.

As regards the possible bending of great lenses under their own weight, although this sometimes occurs in a small degree, both sides are affected in a nearly compensatory manner, while in a mirror there is no such compensation. Any slight imperfection at any point on the surface of the lens, whether from defective workmanship or bending of the lens itself, produces much less error in the image than in the case of a reflector. The slightest imperfection of workmanship or distortion of the mirror from its own weight, as well as any difference of temperature between the front and back, will utterly ruin the image, while the performance of a lens would be much less affected by the same circumstances. Partly for this reason, reflecting telescopes very rarely give any such definition as refractors.

Then again, the refractor will give a much larger per cent. of the incident light than the speculum metal reflector. I speak of speculum metal reflectors because the difficulty of preserving the reflecting silver film on large silvered glass mirrors is so great, and the process of resilvering becomes so formidable, that I believe them to be impracticable.

From what I have said, as well as from other considerations, which it is not necessary to mention here, I have not the slightest doubt that our future advance must be along the line of the refracting telescope.

Until a comparatively recent date wooden tubes were used for telescopes, but these being sluggish as regards equalization of temperature, a star image was often defective and showed wings

before all the parts of the telescope had acquired the same temperature. This defect, however, has been completely eliminated by the introduction of the metallic tube, which, with a minimum amount of weight, gives a maximum amount of stiffness and produces uniformity of temperature very rapidly.

But, in order that the object glass, as its size becomes so great, should also rapidly assume and constantly maintain uniformity of temperature in all its parts, I have separated the crown and flint lenses in construction so as to allow a free circulation of air between them. In the Lick telescope this separation amounts to some six inches with holes in the sides of the cell, thus allowing a free circulation of air between the lenses.

Thus we have to-day a refracting telescope that has steadily grown in size with increasing perfection in all its parts, and which has, beyond question, a still greater future before it. What the pledge of the past has been, the future will fulfil. What, then, are the possibilities of accomplishment for these great telescopes of the future ?

We may answer that they will do great work anywhere, although much depends on the circumstances in which they are placed. For the finest work they should have good atmospheric conditions, but these may be obtained at various places throughout the world, both at ordinary as well as higher altitudes. When used under such conditions much will be added to our present knowledge of astronomy.

The great and rapid strides which have lately been made in astrophysics, principally in the line of photometry, photography and spectroscopy, added to the vast amount of work which will always remain to be done in the older astronomy of motion, opens a field for the most powerful means of research. These monster telescopes may be characterized as the great light-collectors and space-penetrators of the universe, and their province, the solution of the ultimate problems of science.

ALVAN G. CLARK.

DOES THE REPUBLICAN PARTY NEED RE-ORGANIZATION?

BY SENATOR JOSEPH N. DOLPH, OF OREGON.

THERE has been some talk, since the result of the late Presidential election became known, concerning the necessity for a re-organization of the Republican party. Just what is meant by re-organization is not clear. If it is only proposed that changes shall be made in the methods of conducting political campaigns, in order to secure a better canvass and more accurate information as to the political affiliations or preferences of electors; to bring those who are temporarily charged with the management of the campaign and the party leaders into touch with the masses, and to provide a more effective means for reaching the individual voter, no one will question the necessity.

We have, as a people, largely outgrown spectacular campaign methods. Political campaign speeches no longer produce the effect they once did. Effective campaign work in the future requires educational and intellectual methods, thoroughly organized local committees and intelligently directed local effort. If, however, this suggestion of a necessity for the re-organization of the party is but a form of complaint against the managers of the late contest, or if it is intended as a reflection upon the capacity and fidelity of party leaders, National or State, the imputation is not justified by facts.

There is no good reason for attributing the defeat of the Republican party to the mismanagement of those who were in charge of the campaign. To do this would be to belittle the struggle through which we have just passed and to overlook the real causes of defeat. Nor is the defeat, in my judgment, justly chargeable to the protective tariff policy or other policies of the Republican party. The principles of the party have not changed

since 1888, when they were endorsed by the people in the election of Mr. Harrison.

Neither can defeat be justly attributed to the re-nomination of Mr. Harrison. Even his political opponents concede his ability and the strength and marked individuality of his administration, which has been conducted with fidelity to the principles of his party, and which will pass into history as one of the ablest, purest and most successful this country has ever had. Whatever may be their party affiliations all Americans can point with pride to President Harrison as a typical American.

The cause of defeat lies deeper than any I have mentioned. There is and has been for some time throughout the entire country a feeling of discontent, which has manifested itself in many ways. It defeated the Republican party in 1884, overthrew the Cleveland Administration in 1888, and again reversed the popular verdict in 1892.

This spirit of unrest, this warfare with existing conditions, in which "Past and to come seem best and things present worst," is not confined to this country, but is manifest everywhere, finding more vigorous expression in the great centres of population, such as gave the large Democratic majorities at the late election. If this discontent were only local the cause of it might be attributed to party policy, but as it is widely diffused throughout the civilized world and is to be found in places where conditions are altogether dissimilar, in absolute monarchies and republics alike, it cannot be charged to any party.

There were no doubt minor causes which contributed to the result of the late election. But the principal cause appears to have been this widespread discontent, the visible manifestations of which were mainly the hostility of labor to capital and opposition to the party charged for the time being with the enforcement of the laws and the maintenance of order. By its real or supposed grievances against capital the discontented laboring element was prepared to charge all its alleged wrongs to existing conditions. Domestic competition has been for years steadily forcing down the prices of the products of human labor and reducing the income derived from capital invested in productive industries, while laborers have demanded and secured increased wages and fewer hours of work. Under these conditions the conflicts between labor and capital which have taken place were inevitable,

and naturally resulted in a tendency of the laboring classes to ally themselves with the party which has persistently charged all labor troubles to the policy of the party in power.

The Republican tariff policy is designed for the protection of American capital, as well as of American labor, so as to secure the investment of capital in industries which give employment to labor and secure fair wages to the laborer. Labor appears to have arrayed itself against the party of protection because capital shared in the beneficent results of the protective policy, and it must be left to learn by experience what it cannot be taught by precept. It will soon learn that every blow aimed at American industries will fall heaviest upon American labor.

It could hardly be expected that the experience of one generation would be sufficient for two succeeding ones. Further experience under free trade seems to be now necessary to convince the people of this country that the protective system is indispensable to national and individual prosperity.

If, again, by the re-organization of the Republican party is meant the abandonment of those principles of the party which are supposed to have met with popular disapproval, such a re-organization is impossible. It would involve a final dissolution of the party. Any party which can adopt new principles to meet every chance emergency, and which has no higher aim than public plunder, is not worthy to receive, and cannot hope long to retain, the support of that portion of the country without which no party can succeed. It has been gravely suggested that the Republican party should seek success by an abandonment or a modification of its position upon the tariff, by the adoption of some modified financial proposition which would satisfy a supposed popular demand, or by a formal declaration against federal control of federal elections. The Republican party must look for success in the triumph of its principles, and not by trimming its sails to catch every popular breeze.

The results of elections in this country, owing to election methods in vogue in some portions of the Union, cannot be accepted as intelligent and deliberate expressions of the popular will, and if they could, it is better for parties, as well as for individuals, to be in the minority and be right, than to be wrong and be with the majority. To abandon the tenets of the party because of an occasional adverse popular verdict would be

to invite contempt and to court destruction. Popular opinion is not always right. History proves that the "Hosanna" of yesterday is often the cruel and malevolent "Crucify him!" of to-day. As has been said, "He who in this nineteenth century echoes the cry that the voice of the multitude is the voice of God is just the man who, if he had been born two thousand years ago, would have been the loudest and hoarsest in that cringing crowd of slaves who bowed before a prince invested with the delegated majesty of Rome and cried, It is the voice of God and not of man."

If the principles of the Republican party are right, instead of abandoning them or wavering in its purposes, it should be true to them, and let disorganizing elements slough off, until, with united ranks, it is prepared to achieve victory, or, if necessary for the sake of its principles, to suffer defeat again.

If free trade, free coinage or any of the current wild financial and other visionary schemes are to prevail, it will not be under Republican rule. Republicans believe that "the greatest friend of truth is time," and expect Republican principles to vindicate themselves. They confidently believe that the experience of the people under one Democratic administration, with no obstacle in the way of carrying out its policy, will be sufficient to cause the reversal of the popular verdict, and place the Republican party again in power.

The Republican party in the future, as in the past, must be courageous and aggressive for the right. As it believes that the prosperity of the country requires that every dollar of our currency, whether of gold, silver or paper, shall be of equal purchasing and debt-paying power, it will in the future as in the past be found contending for honest money. As it believes that our history as a nation teaches that all our national and individual prosperity has been the result of the protective policy, it will be found advocating protection of American industries. It will adhere to its position in favor of pure and fair elections. Whatever differences of opinion there may be concerning the expediency of legislation to extend to all the electors of the United States, in the exercise of the right of suffrage at federal elections, the protection of the laws of the United States, the Republican party is not likely to abandon the position either that Congress has constitutional power to enact such legislation or that it is now necessary for the protection of the political rights of citizens.

The federal government was formed by and for all the people of the Union and it is supreme within the limitations of the federal constitution in all the States and over every citizen of the Republic. The power to preserve its constitutional prerogatives and to see that the electors of the Union are not deprived of their constitutional right to control and give direction to the federal government has not only been wisely but necessarily conferred upon Congress, and the grant of power carries with it the duty of its exercise when necessary.

Above all, the Republican party will continue to stand, as it has always stood, as a bulwark against all efforts to minimize the power of the national government, as the inheritor of the principles of the great men who formed the constitution and secured its adoption, as the exponent of the views of the great Chief Justice, John Marshall, concerning the constitutional powers of the States and of the federal government,—of those great principles which he annunciated and which to-day give life and vigor to the federal constitution and power to the national government to do the things which are necessary for the national prosperity and the welfare of the people.

The Republican party, wedded to truth, duty, and patriotism, needs but to be true to itself. It needs no re-organization which involves an abandonment of its principles or a change of its purposes. In any declaration of principles the party must go forward and not backward. During its entire history it has resolutely grappled with new questions as they have arisen and may be expected to do so in the future. I will not venture to predict the advance steps which the party may be expected to take, but will suggest a matter which might well be made prominent in the next declaration of party principles. It is the subject of immigration, now demanding the serious consideration of the American people. The rush of foreigners to our shores is so great and the immigration is of such a character as seriously to test our powers of assimilation if not to menace our institutions. The annual increase by immigration of artisans, mechanics and laborers causes undue competition with labor in this country. Some effective legislation is demanded for the preservation of American institutions and the protection of American labor.

On the 4th of March next the Democratic party will assume full responsibility for the national administration. The Repub-

lican party will retire from the administration with a record of which it need not be ashamed, and which will grow brighter as time advances. It will await with confidence that vindication of its principles which time is sure to bring, and which a trial of Democratic policy will hasten.

The late contest was understood on both sides to be mainly between the tariff policies of the two great parties. The success of the Republican party, it was believed, would insure the continuance of the protective policy for another four years; the success of the Democratic party, it was supposed, would insure a trial of the Democratic tariff policy, as declared in its national platform. If a reversal of the present tariff policy does not take place when the Democratic party comes into control of both branches of Congress, it will be apparent that the party has come into power under false pretences, conclusive evidence that its assaults upon the Republican economical and financial policies were made for political effect only, and that it was not sincere in its declaration of principles in its national platform.

Prompt action by the incoming administration will be better for the country than delay. If free trade is a good thing for the country we cannot have it too soon. If it is not, that can now be satisfactorily shown only by experience. If the Democratic party does not intend to overthrow the protective system, the sooner that fact is demonstrated the better. The threat to our industries by the declaration in its national platform and by its success cannot fail to have a demoralizing effect upon our industries. In fact, such an effect is already apparent. It would be far better that the threatened blow should fall at once, or the fear of it be removed at once, than that the business of the country should be indefinitely held in suspense and apprehension.

It is idle for the Democratic party to seek to evade the responsibility incident to its lease of power or the consequences of a practical test of its principles. Those who have been made to believe that a protective tariff is a fraud and a robbery of the consumer will naturally demand speedy relief from the alleged burdens imposed by the present tariff laws. After years of discussion of the tariff question and of denunciation of the present tariff laws, they will not be satisfied with being assured that "nothing will be done rashly" or with the statement that it will take an indefinite time and protracted investigation to determine

what legislation is desirable. They will demand that a special session of Congress be called by the incoming administration to enact tariff legislation and that the country shall not be left longer than necessary under the alleged burdens of Republican tariff and financial legislation.

For years the discussion of almost all political questions has led up to, or has been diverted to, the tariff, and nearly all the evils in this country, trusts, strikes, monopolies, the unequal distribution of wealth, the depression of agriculture, farm mortgages, low wages, poverty, corrupt elections and bad government, have been persistently charged to the protective policy by Democratic orators, in and out of Congress, and by the Democratic press. If now, when the Democratic party has the power to destroy, with a blow, this alleged cause of so many evils, it does not do it, the farmers and laborers, who have been made to believe that a tariff for revenue will bring them prosperity, will insist on knowing why the protective policy has in the eyes of the Democratic leaders suddenly become too sacred for the profane touch of Democracy.

The Democratic party will find that cowardice and inaction will be as dangerous as fidelity to its principles, and that whatever policy it pursues will lead to its discomfiture and the restoration of the Republican party to power.

JOSEPH N. DOLPH.

SOLUTIONS OF THE LABOR PROBLEM.

BY DAVID DUDLEY FIELD AND OREN B. TAFT.

I. INDUSTRIAL COÖPERATION.

BY DAVID DUDLEY FIELD.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for May 1885 contained a paper of mine on industrial coöperation, in which I gave the outlines of a scheme which appeared to me feasible for reconciling capital and labor. Some criticisms upon the scheme lead me now to follow up the discussion.

Are we any nearer a reconciliation between capital and labor than we were a decade ago? So far from it, there is apparently greater antagonism than there ever was, or rather, I should say, there is greater display of antagonism. Why is it so? Certainly men are improving in intelligence. Is it because the problem is unsolvable? This I do not believe.

There are several reasons why the progress has been so slow. The first and greatest is the action of the workmen themselves in resorting to violence and annoyance in order to gain their ends. By workmen I mean all those who contribute to material products by the labor of their hands alone, whether they be called laborers, wage-earners, or operators. These form a large class in themselves, though they are a minority, and a small minority, of the whole population. Their great mistake has been, as I have said, in resorting to violence. Rare must be the occasions in any civilized country when violent methods can serve a useful purpose in the redress of wrongs. But here, where manhood suffrage prevails, everything can be obtained by law, so far as it is within the domain of law. So large a body of voters as the wage-earners will be sure to obtain by the suffrage all that suffrage can force from the government of the country. Violence is therefore unnecessary. It is moreover impolitic, because it alienates the majority.

Workmen should learn this lesson: That they cannot succeed against the wishes of the rest of the people. Read a page or two out of recent history. It is not very long since a railway train

was stopped without previous notice in a tunnel at New York by the desertion of the engineers half a mile or so from the station. The train bore men, women and children, some persons perhaps in feeble health. The stoppage of the train under such circumstances was a work worthy of brigands. It inflicted grievous wrong on unoffending persons in order to coerce the railway company. Two months ago strikers at Homestead violently opposed the landing of the Pinkerton men from barges on the Monongahela, fired on them, and attempted to cover the water with oil and set it on fire. Later on, at Buffalo, cars were set on fire and rails torn up. In New York walking delegates entered buildings in the course of construction, and the workmen obeyed, like so many slaves, breaking their engagements and bringing the work to a stand-still. In Tennessee, miners, who opposed the employment of convicts in the mines, being unable, or not attempting, to procure a repeal of the law directing such employment, sought by arson and murder to prevent its enforcement. In the States of Tennessee, Pennsylvania and New York the militia was called out by thousands to repress the disorders, causing much hardship to the soldiers and much expense to the States or their municipalities. Do the men who create these troubles imagine that they can thus coerce a free and gallant people? They may go on thus for a season, but they will come to naught in the end, because their conduct is incompatible with the order of society, and all the instincts of manhood are against them.

How many American citizens were engaged in these disorders I do not know. A report of a speech made in Congress states that in the crowd which insulted and abused the captive Pinkertons were foreign women and children. If these foreigners come here to break our laws, we had better punish them first and then send them back whence they came. All these disturbers of the peace, foreign or native, acted in defiance of law, those in New York in defiance of express provisions of the Penal Code.

Now then, if we eliminate annoyance, menace and violence from the controversy between capital and labor, what are the means by which we may hope to reconcile them? Compulsory arbitration will not avail. The hiring of labor is, in its essence, a contract of sale. The employer buys the labor and the laborer sells it. If the State should attempt to fix the price in this transaction, it might for the same reason fix the price of land or corn

or any other commodity in any other sale. This would be despotism, and no modern society would submit to it. We may as well first as last assume that the hirer and the hired *must agree between themselves*. This is fundamental. The moment it becomes established that the State, that is the body of citizens, may decree the price of labor, that moment the reign of the commune begins. It would take but a few years, under this theory of paternal government, to gather to itself all business and all fortunes. Who can foretell what evils may befall us when we once fall into the grasp of this new octopus of man's creation ? *Obsta principus.*

What, then, can the State do ? What could the law accomplish if the wisest heads in the country were called in to advise ? There is in my opinion one way, and one way only ; and that is, by all means in its power to induce the capitalist and the workman to act in harmony. How can this be effected ? The State cannot compel the individual citizen to take his workmen into any kind of partnership ; but it may compel those to whom it grants corporate franchises for purposes of profit to accept the franchises on condition of giving the workman an interest in the product. A very great share of modern enterprises is undertaken by corporations. They are the creations of the State, and if they take grants they must submit to the terms of the grantor.

Let us imagine such an establishment as I suggest. Suppose a factory to be chartered, with a capital of a million of dollars divided into two hundred thousand shares of five dollars each, three-fifths of them to be payable in cash or property, as at present, and two-fifths in prospective labor ; the former to be invested in land, buildings, machinery, and whatever else may be necessary for such an undertaking, and the latter reserved for such workmen as may be taken into the concern ; the skilled workmen to be allowed wages, say, for illustration, at the highest rates of the market, four dollars a day or more, and the unskilled two dollars a day, and each one to be registered for four hundred shares. If the earnings were six per cent. on the capital each skilled workman would be credited in twelve months, that is to say for 300 days' work, with $1,200 for wages and $120 for profit. Deducting $500 for his supplies, including food, clothing, and lodging, there would be left to his credit at the end of the year $820, which would pay for a hundred and sixty-four shares of the stock. He would then have had his living and become the owner of a hundred and sixty-

four shares of the company. In the next year he would acquire a hundred and sixty-four additional shares, and in less than three years would have more than paid for all the four hundred. The rate of wages, the supplies furnished, the admission and dismissal of share-workers, and the discipline of the establishment should be vested in all the shareholders, actual or expectant, while the financial department, and the purchases and sales, should be in the hands of the cash or property shareholders. Capital and labor would thus be brought into closer communion, and made to lean on each other. To this end the requirement of a cash or property capital would be in part dispensed with, and instead of it an obligation to labor accepted. The share-workman must have the means of living while he is earning the price of his shares. He must be enabled to live as cheaply as possible, by having his supplies furnished at the lowest price. He must have fair wages, and withal reasonable maintenance, and the prospect of bettering his condition by becoming a participant in the profits of the combined labor and capital. But all concerned should have the power of superintending the conduct of the workmen, choosing between applicants and dismissing the idle or incompetent, recompensing them, of course, for what they have already earned and saved.

Is such a scheme as this an idle dream? Something like it has been tried in other countries. Any one who has shopped at the Bon Marché in Paris, may have been struck with the refusal of the shopboy who brought a parcel to the carriage in the street, to take the usual gratuity, bowing his head with thanks, as if to say, I am a part proprietor in this establishment.

One objection I have heard made to such a scheme is, that the share-worker will have to run the risk of losses. That, however, is only what the share-capitalist has to meet, and if the workman is as well off as the capitalist, there will be small reason to complain. It might be stipulated, however, that the workman should in any event retain the portion of his wages set apart for his living, or he might insure his share to a greater or less extent, paying therefor a premium not greater than he now pays to his union or other society of workmen.

Another objection that I have heard is that the scheme proposed would benefit only skilled workmen, those whose wages would naturally exceed their cost of living. That would depend, of course, upon the price of the unskilled workman's labor. At all

events the scheme would benefit the skilled workman, and thus create an incentive to the unskilled to perfect himself in his art.

What could the State do for the encouragement of such a coöperation of capital and labor? Simply change the statutes respecting corporations, so as to provide for the division of the shares of corporations formed for profit into small parcels within the reach of workmen, and fill up a few details. Consult the history of coöperative societies in other countries. The problem has been largely worked out there. If we can solve the problem fully, we shall confer a great benefit on all classes of our people.

I have great sympathy with the workingmen, which even their outbreaks of violence have not extinguished, though they have saddened it. If I thought that the workmen would listen to me, I would say to them: Be brave, but be peaceable; you have in the ballot a weapon stronger than the sword or the right arm; remember that many a present millionaire was not long ago a workman like you; your surest reliance is on the sympathy of your countrymen, on prudent counsels and the rapid march of time.

DAVID DUDLEY FIELD.

II. LABOR ORGANIZATIONS IN LAW.

BY OREN B. TAFT.

A CONSIDERATION of the labor problem must recognize the following facts:

1. That there are three interests involved—the commonwealth or social fabric, capital, and labor; that all these are or must be invested with both duties and rights, defined by law both for their defence and as a means of compelling the discharge of responsibilities. Capital has already an existence in the statutes, enabling it to enforce, as well as to defend, its rights. Having such existence it may be compelled to discharge its duties. Labor itself must have a legal standing of like importance, and for the same reasons. The commonwealth has the right to enact any statute restricting organizations that so disturb affairs as to threaten society; it has the duty of providing for, and enforcing as law, the rights and duties belonging to capital and labor in their relations one to the other.

2. All interests involved must reckon upon the expanding and inspiring influence of the American political and social idea; this country began its career by declaring that all men are born

equal; there was to be no law save that of ability and opportunity to stand between what any man has rightfully accomplished and what any other might; it made each man the peer of every other for every lawful personal interest he might have. Under this influence so rapidly have men gone from the employed to the employer that the distinction in rank has almost disappeared.

3. A third fact which must be kept in view is that labor, competent to organize and direct itself, is something more than a commodity; that the nature of both capital and labor is such that neither may safely be regardless of the rights of the other. All capital has its origin in labor. Labor is vitally dependent on capital. To treat labor as a thing to be bought in the cheapest market, is to treat it as a commodity and not as a man. The public, the commonwealth, sees in this labor a citizen in whom it has a valid interest, and whatever unmans him is inimical to capital itself, to labor and to the commonwealth.

It is also true that labor has grown intelligent and is taking this new view of itself; that if the mind of the individual to whom it belongs is sufficiently intelligent to comprehend the purpose and enter into the spirit of the work which he is called upon to do, with that same relative degree of intelligence and faithfulness which his own part bears to that of the intelligence, capital, and effort furnished by his employer, his recompense should bear a like relative return; and, further, that it is not a privilege, but an inherent right belonging to him that he be consulted, and his own intelligence be allowed to enter into any consideration that has to do with that labor. More than this, labor has grown intelligent of the fact that there is a vast difference between the lack of friction with which capital attains its legitimate ends, and that with which labor attains its ends; that all the machinery of State stands ready to protect and further the interests of capital, while labor is left absolutely without law, a law unto itself, save when it commits some act, to be dealt with as a criminal; that there is no recognition in law of intelligent labor, capable of directing itself, as a something to be developed, capable of undertaking enterprises, of assuming responsibilities and an ability to guarantee its undertakings.

These facts recognized they become evidence that we are on the eve of one of those rare events, when in the evolution of commercial economy an entirely new factor is to come into affairs; when or-

ganized labor is to take its place in law and the courts by the side of, and be the equal of, capital, with like legal recognition, advantages, encouragement, and with none the less of its responsibilities and liabilities, willing to imperil the liberty of its person as the guarantee for its good conduct.

Intelligent organized labor is ready to consider with capital and the general public, and equally well to comprehend, such propositions as the following:

I. That it will not do for labor to have reason to believe capital has a more solid standing in law than labor.

II. But capital has a more valid existence so far as statutes and courts are concerned, because in making contracts with labor, it has such possessions as may be reached by law in case of failure to execute its contracts.

III. It obtains this position of power in law, only by having made the concession of an unrestricted liberty with its own capital after having failed to perform its obligation recognized by law. For a standing place in the law, under a commonwealth stronger than all parties to any contract, capital voluntarily permits itself to be sued, to be annulled, to lose the right to do business, to be confiscated, if needs be, to make good its contracts.

IV. The anomaly and weakness of the social order with labor not a like factor in law, is, that only one party in a contract made between capital and labor is in any valid way liable to suffer a penalty, in the form of damages for non-performance. There is nothing in the laborer until he becomes in some sense a capitalist to make him a valid person in the courts; until then he has no right to ask the commonwealth to inflict penalty upon capital since he has no capital of his own to be confiscated in a similar case.

V. A law ought to be made which would recognize the facts. The facts are, that the laborer is a capitalist, his capital is *his own person—himself.* In a contract he offers on his part *himself* to do a certain amount of labor.

VI. The laborer who enters into a contract with capital will not occupy the same standing place in common justice and law until, according to statute, it cedes to the same third party, the commonwealth, as representative of the public and social order, the full power in the same certain case to restrict it, to confiscate it. It must be legal for the commonwealth to confiscate capital, as it is; and for the same government, in the same interests, to imprison labor, unless it shall offer a money equivalent, whenever the possibility of fulfilling contract is frustrated voluntarily.

The remedy proposed, then, restricting this question at this time to organized labor, is the enactment of a law providing for the existence of labor organizations, and permitting none to exist after a proper time except under that law.

In outlines, the suggestions for such a law would be something as follows:

Any number of persons more than (say) five in number, who may desire to form a society, organization or corporation, whose purpose shall be to promote the interests of its members in the joint control and management

of their labor, in whatever pertains to such labor, as wages, time, etc., shall be required to file (with the proper officer of the State, to be determined in forming this law) a certificate, signed by all its members, stating its object, including the kind of labor proposed to be done, and its ability to perform it, where located, etc.; such certificate to state the full name, age, residence, and the married or single condition of each member. This certificate shall also be recorded in the county where such organization is located, and if it does business in more than one county, then in every such county; all changes in membership or residence to be made a matter of record within five days; no withdrawal to be allowed during existing contracts entered into by the organization.

This corporation shall in law be capable of suing and being sued, have and use a common seal; shall have a board of managers with power, under restrictions to be determined, of making contracts involving the time, wages, and labor of all or any portion of its members, as comprehended within the purpose for which organized. The membership being a voluntary one, with a declared ability to perform its contracts, the courts shall be given power to enforce the labor of its members, jointly or severally, as the case may be, in the fulfilment of any contract, to the extent of imprisonment in case of failure or refusal, the health and physical ability at the time, if pleaded, to be a matter within the discretion of the court, the usual proper means of deter, mining the same being used. A desertion from the organization, failure to respond to summons, or taking oneself beyond the jurisdiction of the court, pending any adjudication, to be a contempt of court, shal. be punishable by imprisonment or fine or both, in the discretion of the court, with power to reach the person in any of the States permitting it or having adopted the law; a money equivalent for the person in the guarantee of any contract under consideration in court always to be accepted, the principle being that the person of the laborer (it being his capital) is held only as an offset for the capital of the employer, which is money or its equivalent.

All existing associations, societies, or organizations, known as, or in the nature of, "Federations of Labor" shall be declared unlawful, after giving them a proper time, say three or six months, in which to reorganize if they so wish, under the new law. The members of such existing organizations after such a time has expired, if not disbanded, or having complied with the law, shall be subject to arrest and a penalty by imprisonment to be inflicted as may be determined.

In proposing this remedy, whether the infliction of imprisonment upon the person of the laborer, who, after voluntarily becoming a member of a legally-organized labor association, then of his own volition refuses to furnish his capital—that is, his ability to labor—in compliance with a contract, is constitutional or not, has not entered into this present consideration, under the view that the problem is important enough to warrant constitutional changes if necessary to a satisfactory solution.

OREN B. TAFT.

FLIRTING WIVES.

BY MRS. AMELIA E. BARR.

If some good and thoughtful woman who died fifty years ago could return to this world, what in our present life would most astonish her? Would it be the wonders of steam, electricity, and science; the tyranny of the working classes, or the autocracy of servants? No! It would be the amazing development of her own sex—the preaching, lecturing, political women; the women who are doctors and lawyers; who lose and win money on horses, or in stocks and real estate; the women who talk slang, and think it an accomplishment; who imitate men's attire and manners; who do their athletic exercises in public; and, perhaps more astonishing than all, the women who make marriage the cloak for much profitable post-nuptial flirtation.

For her own sex engaged in business, she might find excuses or even admiration; and even for the unfeminine girls of the era, she might plead Mrs. Poyser's opinion, that "the women are made to suit the men." But for young wives notorious for their flirting and their "followers," she could have nothing but unqualified scorn and condemnation. For the sentiment demanding absolute fidelity in a wife may be said to have the force of a human instinct; in all ages it has exacted from her an avoidance of the very appearance of evil. Therefore a good woman in the presence of a frivolous flirting wife feels as if a law of nature were being broken before her eyes; since behind the wife stands the possible mother, and the claims of family, race and caste, as well as of conjugal honor, are all in her keeping.

Without any exaggeration it may be said that wife-errantry is now as common as knight-errantry once was. The young men of to-day have discovered the personal advantage and safety there is in the society of another man's wife. They transpose an old

proverb, and practically say: "Fools marry, and wise men follow their wives." For, if the husband be only complacent, it is such a safe thing to flirt with a pretty wife. Young girls are dangerous and might lure them into matrimony; but they have no fear of bigamy. They can whisper sweet words to a gay, married flirt; they can walk, and talk, and dance, and ride with her; they can lounge in her dusky drawing-room or in her opera box, and no one will ask them the reason why, or make any suggestion about their "intentions."

How far this custom affects the morals of the woman is not at first obvious; but we must insist on this recognized premise: "Society has laid down positive rules regarding the modesty of women, and apart from these rules it is hard to believe modesty can exist. For all conventional social laws are founded on principles of good morals and good sense; and to violate them without a sufficient reason destroys nicety of feeling, sweetness of mind, and self-respect." It is no excuse to say that propriety is old-maidish, and that men like smart women, or that no harm is intended by their flirtations. The question is: Can married women preserve their delicacy of thought and their nobleness of manner; can they be truly loyal to their husbands and to themselves throughout the different phases of a recognized flirtation? It is an impossible thing.

Suppose a beautiful girl to be wooed and won by a man in every way suitable to her desires. She has accepted his love and his name, and vowed to cleave to him, and to him only, till death parts them. The wooing has been mainly done in full dress, at balls and operas, or in hours tingling with the expectancy of such conditions. The aroma of roses, the rustle of silks and laces, the notes of music, the taste of bon-bons and sparkling wines, were the atmosphere; and the days and weeks went by to the sense of flying feet in a ball room, or to enchanted loiterings in greenhouses, and behind palms and flowers on decorated stairways.

The young wife is unwilling to believe that marriage has other and graver duties. She has been taught to live in the present only, and she is, therefore, cynical and apathetic concerning all things but dress and amusements. The husband has to return to business, which has been somewhat neglected; arrears of duty are to be met. He feels it necessary to attend to the question of supplies; he is, likely, a little embarrassed by the long holiday of wooing

and honeymooning, and he would be grateful for some retrenchment and retirement, for the purpose of home-making.

The young wife has no such intentions; she resents and contradicts them on every occasion; and after the first pang of disappointment is over, he finds it the most prudent and comfortable plan to be indifferent to her continued frivolity. He is perhaps even flattered to find her so much admired; perhaps, in his heart, rather thankful to be relieved from the trouble of admiring her. As for any graver thoughts, he concludes that his wife is no worse than A's and B's and C's wives; that she is quite able to take care of herself, and that in a multitude of adorers there is safety.

Thus, in a majority of cases, begins the career of the married flirt. But the character is not a corollary of marriage, if the proper conditions were present when the wife was a young woman. There is no salvation in the Order of Matrimony; no miracles wrought at the altar of Grace Church, or at St. Thomas's. She that is frivolous, giddy, and selfish is likely to continue frivolous, giddy, and selfish; and marriage merely supplies her with a wider field and greater opportunities for the indulgence of her vanity and greed.

She reënters society with every advantage of youth, beauty, wealth, and liberty; released from the disabilities under which unmarried girls lie; armed with new powers to dazzle and to conquer. No longer a competitor for a matrimonial prize, she is a rival ten times more dangerous than she was. Setting aside the wrong done to the sacredness of the connubial relation, she now becomes the most subtle enemy to the prospects of all the unmarried girls in her set. What is the bud to the perfect rose? The timid, blushing maiden pales and subsides before the married siren who has the audacity and charm of a conscious intelligence. It is not without good reason that special balls and parties have come into fashion for social buds; they are the necessary sequence to the predominance of married sirens, with whom in a mixed society no young girl can cope. They have the floor and the partners; they monopolize all the attention, and their pleasure is of the greatest importance. And their pleasure is to flirt—to flirt in all places and at all hours.

In vain will some young aspirant to marriage display in the presence of the married flirt her pretty accomplishments. She may sing her songs, and play her mandolin never so sweetly, but

the young men slip away with some one or other of the piquant brides of the past year. And in the privacy of the smoking-room it is the brides, and not the young girls, who are talked about—what dresses they wear or are likely to wear, how their hair is done, the history of the jewels which adorn them, and the clever thingsthey have said or implied.

Before we condemn too much the society girls of the time, we ought to consider the new enemy who stands in the way of their advancement to marriage. Is it not quite natural that the most courageous girls should refuse the secondary place to which married flirts assign them, and endeavor to meet these invaders with their own weapons? If so, much of the forwardness of the present young girl is traceable to the necessity forced upon her by these married competitors. For it is a fact that young men go to the latter for advice and sympathy. They tell them about the girls they like, and their fancies are nipped in the bud. For the married flirt's first instinct is to divest all other women of that air of romance, with which the nobility and chivalry of men have invested womanhood for centuries. So she points out with a pitiless exactness all the small arts which other women use; and is not only a rival to some young girl, but a traitor to her whole sex.

And yet she is not only tolerated but indulged. People giving entertainments know that their success will be in a large measure dependent upon the number of beautiful young wives present. They know the situation is all wrong, but they are sure they cannot either fight the wrong, or put it right; and in the meantime their particular ball will not increase the evil very much. Not fifty years ago, it was the young beauties that were considered and looked after, and the gentlemen asked to an entertainment were asked with reference to the unmarried girls: for it was understood that any married women present would, of course, be wrapped up in their own husbands. Then a wife accepting attentions from one young man after another would have aroused the contempt and disapproval of every man and woman present.

Vanity in the first place leads young wives to flirting, but grosser motives soon follow. For whatever other experiences matrimony brings, it generally stimulates a woman's love of money; and the married siren soon makes her "followers" understand that she is "a very practical little woman, and does

not care for a sonnet, or a serenade, or a bouquet of fresh flowers." A summer's cruise in a fine yacht, a seat on a coach, an opera box, a jewel, dinners, drives and luncheons, are the blackmail which the married flirt expects, in return for her sighs, sentiment, and advice.

It is indeed curious to note the change of fashion in this respect. Let any one turn over the novels of half a century ago, and he will see that the favorite plan for compromising a woman's honor was to induce her to accept the loan of money, or the gift of jewels. If the unfortunate heroine did so, no novelist would have dared to offer an apology for her. But this age of luxury and laxity has exploded the scrupulous delicacy of the Evelinas and Cecilias of the old tales, and the splendidly free, feminine Uhlans of our modern society laugh to scorn the prim modesty of the Richardsonian standard. They assert, if not in words yet by their actions, the right of a woman to make her fascinations serviceable to her.

Some married women contend that their flirtations are absolutely innocent friendships. But in all stations of society, it is a dangerous thing for two people of the opposite sex to chant together the litany of the church of Plato. The two who could do it safely would be the very two who would never dream of such an imprudence. Those who enter into "friendships" of this kind with what they think are the most innocent intentions, should sharply arrest themselves as soon as they are "talked about." For in social judgments, the dictum that "people talked about, generally get what they deserve" is true, however unjust it may appear to be.

Another class of married flirts scorn to make any apology, or any pretence of mere friendship. They stand upon the emancipation of women, and the right of one sex to as much liberty as the other. This kind of siren boldly says: "She does not intend to be a slave like her mother, and her grandmother. She does not propose to tie herself, either to a house or a cradle." She travels, she lives in yachts and hotels, and she does not include a nursery in her plans. She talks of elective affinities, natural emotions of the heart, and contrasts the opportunities of such conditions, with the limitations and the monotony of domestic relations. She makes herself valueless for the very highest natural duties of womanhood, and then talks of her enfranchisement! Yes,

she has her freedom, and what does it mean? More dresses and jewelry, more visits and journeys; while the whole world of parental duties, and domestic tendernesses, lies in ruins at her feet.

The relegation of the married flirt to her proper sphere and duties is beyond the power of any single individual. Society could make the necessary protest, but it does not; for if Society is anything, it is non-interfering. It looks well to it, that the outside, the general public appearance of its members, is respectable; with faults not found out, it does not trouble itself. A charge must be definitely made, before it feels any necessity to take cognizance of it. And Society knows well, that these married sirens draw like magnets. Besides, each entertainer declares: "I am not my sister's keeper, nor am I her Inquisitor or Confessor. If her husband tolerates the pretty woman's vagaries, what right have I, what right has any one, to say a word about her?"

But it is a fact, that if Society frowned on wives who arrogate to themselves the privileges both of young girls and of wives, the custom would become stale and offensive. If it would cease to recognize young married women who are on the terms with their husbands described by Millamant in "The Way of World"—"as strange as if they had been married a long time, and as well bred as if they had never been married at all," young married women would behave themselves better. It is generally thought that Mr. Congreve wrote his plays for a very dissolute age; in reality, they seem to have been written for a decorous, rather strait-laced generation, if we compare it with our own.

AMELIA E. BARR.

HIGH CASTE INDIAN MAGIC.

BY PROF. H. KELLAR.

FIFTEEN years spent in India and the far East have convinced me that the high caste fakirs, or magicians, of Northern India have probably discovered natural laws of which we in the West are ignorant. That they succeed in overcoming forces of nature which to us seem insurmountable, my observation satisfies me beyond doubt.

No topic of the marvellous has excited more general interest and remained in greater obscurity than Hindoo jugglery. Discussion has, through a confusion of terms, lent to the subject a vagueness which it might otherwise have escaped. Magic is defined as "the art of putting in action the power of spirits, or the occult powers of nature"; so it seems proper to use the term magician, in speaking of the esoteric marvel worker, in the sense of a human being who is able to put in action "the occult powers of nature."

News of the strange performances of the Hindoo magicians has reached the West for centuries. Marco Polo's stories of their feats, though at first received in Europe with some credence, afterwards served to foster the impression that he was the willing victim of delusion. The tales of the Crusaders rivalled those told of the achievements of the great Merlin, and we glean from the exploits of Thomas of Ercildoune and the wizards of the North glimpses of what may be the reflected potency of the Tibetan esoterics. Yet, through a thousand years of rumor, the high caste fakir has succeeded in preserving the secret of his powers, which have on more than one occasion baffled my deepest scrutiny, and remained the inexplicable subject of my lasting wonder and admiration.

When I appeared before Queen Victoria, at Balmoral, in 1878, I was asked if I could rival the feats of levitation which Her Majesty's officers in Northern India had observed and described in their letters home. My reply was that with proper mechanical appliances I could produce an illusion of levitation and appear to overcome, as the jugglers did, the force of gravity, but that the actual feat of suspending the operation of that force was beyond my powers. As an evidence of the world-wide curiosity manifested in these truly wonderful phenomena, I may mention the fact that the King of Burmah, before whom I appeared at Mandalay, and the venerable Dom Pedro, in the Teatro Dom Pedro Secundo at Rio, made similar requests, to which I was compelled to return the same reply. The Sultan of Zanzibar described to me and asked me to duplicate the feat of the witch doctors of the east coast of Africa and of Borneo, who, he believed, projected their astral bodies at will, with the curious additional power of imparting to the astral image an aspect so hideous and terrifying that its appearance to human eyes could actually destroy life itself.

The jugglers of India may be divided into two classes. The low caste fakirs are met with all over the East, traveling in parties of from three to six. They are arrayed in breech clouts and have an air of pitiable poverty and misery. Each party generally includes one or two women, whose flowing robes assist in the concealment of the necessary juggling apparatus. At none of their *séances*, that I have ever seen or heard of, did the audience completely surround the performers, opportunity being thus offered for evasions and changes.

They all seem to have the same stock in trade, and to be willing to explain any one of their tricks in private for two or three rupees. They are to be met with almost anywhere in Indian cities —in the plazas, open squares, around the bases of the public statues and in the courtyards of the hotels. They content themselves with the sword and basket trick, the duck trick, the mango trick, the pineapple trick, and the manipulation of cobras. All of these, of which I shall speak presently, are readily understood by the practised eye.

The high caste fakirs, on the contrary, are only seen at great public fêtes, such as the coronation of a Prince, the festival of a Maharajah, the coming of age of a Nizam, the grand feast of the

Mohorrum, and such special occasions as the visit of the Prince of Wales to India. I have had the good fortune to be present on all these occasions, and confess that after thirty years' professional experience as a magician, in the course of which I have circumnavigated the globe a baker's dozen of times, and penetrated the remotest corners of the East and West alike, I am still unable to arrive at a satisfactory explanation of the performances I witnessed.

These fakirs—for that term does not imply a reflection upon their personalities or their methods—are very dignified men, of patriarchal appearance, with ascetic faces and long gray beards. All the skilful ones I have seen were quite advanced in years, and were said to have spent their lives in study and in seclusion. It seems plausible indeed to believe their story, that it is only after a life-time of contemplation and study that they are admitted into the higher circles of the esoteric brotherhood, whose seat is in the monasteries of Tibet and in the mountain recesses of northern Hindustan. They are quiet, suave and secretive, and appear to attach an almost religious significance to the manifestations of their power. There is nothing inherently improbable in the theory that they are initiated into a knowledge whose secrets have been successfully preserved for centuries.

That there is anything supernatural in their power I would be the last to concede, for I have spent my life in combating the delusions of supernaturalism and the so-called manifestations of spiritualism.

The most marvellous phenomena which I have observed may be described under the heads of feats of levitation, or the annihilation of gravity; feats of whirling illusion, in which one human form seems to multiply itself into many, which again resolve themselves into one; and feats of voluntary interment.

My first experience with the phenomenon of levitation was in January, 1882, during the course of an engagement I was filling at the Chowringhee Theatre Royal in Calcutta. Mr. Eglinton, a professed spiritual medium, was giving *séances* in Calcutta at the time, and as I openly avowed my ability to expose the frauds of all so-called mediums, I was taken to one of them which occurred in a brilliantly lighted apartment. I will not describe it otherwise than to say that it so puzzled and interested me that I gladly accepted the invitation an evening or two afterwards to

be present with several others at a dark *séance* given by Mr. Eglinton.

It was now that the feat of levitation was apparently performed in the presence of these spectators. The only furniture in the room was a plain teakwood table, a zither, some chairs, two musical boxes and a scroll of paper. A circle having been formed, I was placed on Mr. Eglinton's left and seized his left hand firmly in my right. Immediately on the extinction of the lights, I felt him rise slowly in the air and as I retained firm hold of his hand, I was pulled to my feet, and subsequently compelled to jump on a chair and then on the table in order to retain my hold of him. That his body did ascend into the air on that occasion with an apparently utter disregard of the law of gravity, there can be no doubt. The musical-boxes, playing briskly, then appeared to float through the air above our heads, small green lights appearing and disappearing here and there without visible cause, and the zither playing near the ceiling or immediately over our heads.

I mention this incident as a preface to the more remarkable feats of levitation I will now describe, and also to say that this being my first experience of that strange power, what most excited my wonder was the fact, for I may speak of it as a fact without qualification, that when Mr. Eglinton rose from my side, and, by the hold he had on my right hand, pulled me up after him, my own body appeared for the time being to have been rendered non-susceptible to gravity.

On the occasion of the visit of the Prince of Wales to Calcutta during the winter of 1875–6, I saw a marvel of levitation performed in the presence of the Prince and of some fifty thousand spectators. The place was the Maidam, or Great Plaza of Calcutta, and the old fakir who was the master magician of the occasion did his work out in the open plaza. Around him, in raised seats and on and under the galleries of the neighboring houses, the native Princes and Begums were gathered by the score, arrayed in their silks and jewels, with a magnificence to which our Western eyes are little accustomed.

After a *salaam* to the Prince, the old fakir took three swords with straight cross-barred hilts, and buried them hilt downwards about six inches in the ground. The points of these swords were very sharp, as I afterwards informed myself. A younger

fakir, whose black beard was parted in what we now call the English fashion, although it originated in Hindustan, then appeared and, at a gesture from his master, stretched himself out upon the ground at full length, with his feet together and his hands close to his sides, and, after a pass or two made by the hands of the old man, appeared to become rigid and lifeless. A third fakir now came forward and taking hold of the feet of his prostrate companion, whose head was lifted by the master, the two laid the stiffened body upon the points of the swords, which appeared to support it without penetrating the flesh. The point of one of the swords was immediately under the nape of the man's neck, that of the second rested midway between his shoulders, and that of the third was at the base of his spine; there being nothing under his legs. After the body had been placed on the sword-points the second fakir retired, and the old man, who was standing some distance from it, turned and *salaamed* to the audience.

The body tipped neither to the right nor to the left, but seemed to be balanced with mathematical accuracy. Presently the master took a dagger with which he removed the soil round the hilt of the first sword, and, releasing it from the earth, after some exertion, quietly stuck it into his girdle, the body meanwhile retaining its position. The second and the third swords were likewise taken from under the body, which, there in broad daylight and under the eyes of all the spectators, preserved its horizontal position, without visible support, about two feet from the ground. A murmur of admiration pervaded the vast throng, and with a low *salaam* to the Prince, the master summoned his assistant, and lifting the suspended body from its airy perch they laid it gently upon the ground. With a few passes of the master's hand the inanimate youth was himself again.

Before describing the third and still more marvellous feat of levitation which it has been my privilege to see, I will say that by the use of metal shields, it is perfectly conceivable that the aged fakir could have laid the rigid body of his subject upon the sword points and kept it there without the assistance of anything marvellous. In a closed room with walls and ceilings to which the mechanical appliances of the magician's craft, as we understand it, could be attached, the feat of levitation, as described, could be performed. But this would be, of course, simply an illusion.

During the Zulu war I was in South Africa, travelling north

through Zululand. In Dunn's reservation, two hundred miles north from Durban, in Natal, I saw a witch doctor levitate the form of a young Zulu by waving a tuft of grass about his head, amid surroundings calculated to impress themselves deeply upon the most prosaic imagination. It was evening, and the witch doctor, who belonged to the class described more than once by Rider Haggard with great accuracy, was as revolting in his appearance as the high caste fakirs had been pleasing. A number of fakirs had gathered about our camp fire and I had given them some illustrations of my own skill. They seemed puzzled but were not specially curious. One of them stole away and after some minutes returned with their own conjuror, the witch doctor in question. After considerable solicitation from the natives, the intricacies of which my knowledge of the Zulu language did not enable me quite to penetrate, the conjuror, who at first seemed reluctant to give his consent to an exhibition of his powers before me, took a knob kerry or club and fastened it at the end of a thong of rawhide about two feet long. A young native, tall and athletic, whose eyes appeared to be fixed upon those of the conjuror with an apprehensive steadfastness, took his own knob kerry and fastened it at the end of a similar thong of hide. The two then stood about six feet apart' in the full glare of the fire, and began, all the while in silence, to whirl their knob kerrys about their heads. I noticed that when the two clubs seemed, in their swift flight, almost to come in contact, a spark or flame passed or appeared to pass from one of them to the other. The third time this happened there was an explosion, the spark appeared to burst, the young man's knob kerry was shattered to pieces, and he fell to the ground apparently lifeless.

The witch doctor turned to the high grass a few feet behind us and gathered a handful of stalks about three feet long. Standing in the shadow and away from the fire, he waved, with a swift motion exactly similar to that of the clubs a few minutes before, the bunch of grass around the head of the young Zulu, who lay as dead, in the firelight. In a moment or two the grass seemed to ignite in its flight, although the witch doctor was not standing within twenty feet of the fire, and burned slowly, crackling audibly. Approaching more closely the form of the native in the trance the conjuror waved the flaming grass gently over his figure, about a foot from the flesh. To my intense amazement the re-

cumbent body slowly rose from the ground and floated upward in the air to a height of about three feet, remaining in suspension and moving up and down, according as the passes of the burning grass were slower or faster. As the grass burned out and dropped to the ground the body returned to its position on the ground, and after a few passes from the hands of the witch doctor, the young Zulu leaped to his feet, apparently none the worse for his wonderful experience.

The witch doctors of Africa have a great reputation for making rain and bewitching cows, and frequently seem to make themselves the vehicle of domestic enchantments and household spells, but, taking it altogether, the exhibition I have just described, was, I think, the most remarkable that has come under my vision.

I have heard in India that the fakirs walk in the air, but I have never met an eye-witness of this feat ; the accounts given me came second or third hand, and related that the magician laid himself flat upon the earth, face downwards, for a minute or a minute and a half, then arose, and, pressing his arms tightly against his sides, stepped forwards and upwards as if upon an aerial stairway, walking up into the air to an altitude of several hundred feet. My informant said that it was thought this might be done through an occult knowledge of electrical currents, as if these fakirs changed at will the nature of the electrical current with which their body was charged from the negative to the positive, or *vice versa*, inhaling an electrical influence from the earth which had the effect or destroying the force of gravity. But this seemed to me, as it still seems, unintelligible.

After the Eglinton *séance* in Calcutta, I saw a performance by the whirling fakirs in the Chandee Choke, the Cheapside of Calcutta. There were a score of Englishmen in the party which had gathered by arrangement, and we were escorted to a long empty room in the Chandee Choke, which was apparently an unoccupied store room. There was no back door, and the only two windows in the room—which were at either side of the entrance—looked on the street. There was no one present when we arrived, and we examined the room carefully, testing the walls, ceiling and floor for secret doors, traps, wires, etc., and came to the conclusion that in those respects, at least, all was as it should be. We then drew a chalk line one-third of the way down the room from the door, beyond which we were to remain as audience,

while four fakirs, who appeared at that moment from the street, were to give us an exhibition of their magical powers in the other two-thirds of the apartment, which was destitute of either doors or windows, and, so far as we could inform ourselves, absolutely without means of communication with the adjoining buildings or with the open air.

The old fakir took a chafing-dish and set it about ten feet from the chalk line on his side, casting upon its glowing coals a white powder, which gave out a strong scent of tuberoses, very agreeable to the senses. A fine, white vapor arose from the burning powder and filled the corners of the ceiling, draping the dull panelling with a flying wreath or two, but still permitting a clear view of the end wall. At a point some six or eight feet beyond the chafing dish the old man and his three assistants began dancing slowly; they gave utterance to no sound but whirled faster and faster, with a rhythmic motion, their robes flowing out on either side and blending the four forms into a composite group, of which the tall master was the central figure. Suddenly, to our great astonishment, we became aware that there was only one form visible, that of the old man. The swift whirl of his dance was gradually relaxed, and in a minute or two he became motionless, *salaamed*, advanced in front of the chafing-dish, bowed again, and pointed with a dignified gesture to the rear of the apartment. We all looked eagerly in the direction of his gesture; there was not a living creature, nor indeed an object of any kind visible beyond the line except himself. With another *salaam* he returned to his original position in the rear of the chafing-dish, and began with reverse motion the dance of a moment before. Holding out his arms on each side of him as if the better to balance himself, he now sang in a low, monotonous tone, a chant, the words of which impressed themselves upon my memory and sounded like this:

"*Ai ya or ekto do!*"

In some inexplicable way the monotonous drone of this chant, which fell not unmusically from his lips, seemed to join with the vapors which curled about the scene to bewitch our fancies, or at all events to produce a condition of dreamy delight. If this was hypnotism, so be it; but whether or not the existence of this charmed condition can be ascribed to hypnotic influences, I never felt my senses more completely at my command; and with

my eyes fixed intently on his whirling figure I became aware that he seemed to be throwing from himself portions of his body ; one arm here, the other there, a leg here, and so on, the illusion being perfect, if illusion it was, and the end of the room where he had begun to dance alone becoming gradually filled with figures like his own, only younger, each whirling with the same chant in the same direction. Suddenly the dance again died away, the chant was hushed, and when we looked again there was but one performer visible, the old fakir, who advanced in front of the chafing-dish and asked for *backsheesh*. He received it liberally, and we again made an examination of the room but could discover no explanation of the disappearance of his companions.

Two years ago, in England, I saw the Walker illusion in Dean Street, London, and for the first time it seemed to me that I understood how the whirling illusion could be performed. After a careful study of the Walker illusion, I concluded that I could duplicate it in an act of my own upon the stage, and this I have done, I think, in what I call "The Blue Room, or the House and the Brain," which is based, of course, upon Bulwer's famous story of "The Haunters and the Haunted," which is, I believe, by common consent, the best ghost story in existence.

Colonel, afterwards Gen. Julius Medley, one time commander of the British forces at Lahore, related to me the most remarkable instance of voluntary interment which had come to his knowledge during his service in the East. I had told him of an experience of my own at Secunderabad in 1878, which I shall presently describe. He assured me of the accuracy of his account of the following incident, and as he was a most distinguished soldier and the uncle of my wife, I attach as much importance to his narrative as if I had myself seen what he related.

He said a group of fakirs of the high caste had visited his quarters in the preceding year and offered to give an exhibition. The old man had, without assistance, thrown himself into a trance while in a sitting position upon the ground. His three assistants had then taken hold of the end of his tongue and pushed it back until it closed the epiglottis. They then laid him upon his back, and swathed his body in bandages. The assistant fakirs next filled the eyes, ears, mouth, and nostrils of their apparently unconscious master with a red paste, not unlike putty, and ban-

daged his neck and face. All this took place in the presence of Colonel Medley and his staff. The entire body of the old man was then apparently protected from the atmosphere, as well as from the ants, which in the East attack every living thing that is helpless. It was for this purpose of protection, I learned, that the red paste had been put in the cavities of the face and head. The Colonel and his staff inspected the body of the old man and signified their willingness that the ceremony should proceed. In the meanwhile four of Colonel Medley's soldiers had dug a grave ten feet deep in the enclosed yard of the barracks, and at a gesture from the Colonel the old fakir's assistants lifted his body, and gently placed it in a box sheathed with metal, which was then hermetically sealed under the Colonel's eye. The box was lowered into the tomb, the earth was filled in, the surface was levelled, and millet seed was sown over the grave. The assistants then departed under a solemn promise to return in forty days.

Colonel Medley assured me that for every moment, day and night, of the forty succeeding days he had kept an armed guard on watch above the fakir's grave. He felt morally certain that no human agency could tamper with the tomb or the box without his knowledge. At the end of the specified time the fakirs returned and in the presence of Colonel Medley and his staff the tomb was opened. The body of the aged fakir was removed from the box, not differing in appearance in any way from the condition in which it was buried, except that the linen clothes in which it had been wrapped had rotted and fell away at the touch. The fakirs unwound the bandages, removed the red putty-like preparation from the orifices of the eyes, nose, mouth and ears, and with the assistance of a native woman washed the body in warm water and applied an unguent to the face. The woman blew her breath in the old man's mouth, passed her hand briskly over his limbs, and gave him a smart slap upon the chest. His tongue had in the meantime been put in a natural position and respiration seemed to begin with the blow of the woman's hand. The changes which passed over the features of the old man during the last stage of these preparations were awful to look upon. Misery and effort were painfully depicted upon them. But within five minutes after the breath seemed to reënter his body, the master fakir was himself again.

I was the guest of Colonel Jenkins, the commander of the British forces at that time. The incident of my own experience which I had related to Colonel Medley, and which drew from him the remarkable narrative I have just recounted, was this. I was one of a party of Englishmen present at a grand fête in Secunderabad at the palace of Sir Saler Jung, the Nizam of Secunderabad. An old man, with aquiline features, a long white beard and flashing black eyes, accompanied by his wife, a pretty little woman, came to us as the chief of a band of eight fakirs. In the presence of all the company, one of the young men was tightly bandaged, and a small glass disc was held in front of and directly between his eyes. His master told him to gaze fixedly at the disc, and, as he did so, the others of the band of fakirs began droning a chant, the words of which were :

"Ram, ram, amaram, amaram, amaram,
Ram, ram, amaram, amaram, amaram."

The bandaged fakir appeared to go to sleep under the drowsy hum of this incantation. He soon became to all appearance dead ; the blood seemed to leave the extremities, and his limbs stiffened. His tongue was now turned back until it filled the epiglottis ; a few passes were made over his face by the aged fakir, his eyes turned up until only the whites were visible, the lids were shut, and the red, putty-like substance I have alluded to was used to close his eyes, ears, nostrils, and mouth.

Dr. Crawford, of the army, who was present, then made a careful examination of the man's condition. All the usual tests for death were applied, a mirror was held over his mouth, and to all intents and purposes he was pronounced dead. Dr. Crawford went even to the extent of what might be called cruelty, although the subject was undoubtedly unconscious, and stuck a large bodkin through the palm of the man's hands, through the tips of his ears, his cheeks, the ends of his fingers, his thighs, his arms, and other parts of his body. No blood came from these wounds, but a yellowish ichor followed the point of the needle. The master fakir took a coal of glowing charcoal and placed it on the upturned palm of his subject's hand, causing the flesh to sizzle and an unpleasant odor to arise, but there was no sign of feeling. This condition continued for thirty minutes, at the end of which the master fakir made passes over the body with his hands, removed the red paste from the face and

ears, took off the bandages, and bade us note the result. With horrible contortions and the appearance of great agony, which the old fakir assured us was only an appearance, his assistant returned to the land of the living, apparently as well as ever, except for a badly burned hand.

Bishop Thoburn, of the M. E. Church, in his book on the East, says he has repeatedly heard these stories of suspended animation and voluntary interment, and that Dr. John Martin Honiberger, formerly physician at the Court of Ranjit Singh, ruler of the Sikhs, had told him how a native of Cashmere named Hari Das had been buried alive in the presence of Ranjit Singh, but adds that Dr. Honiberger did not witness this interment himself, and that he can find no evidence in his own experience that such a thing ever takes place.

I am convinced, however, that such voluntary interments have taken place and there is abundant record of such incidents in the experiences of other Anglo-Indian officers besides General Medley. I not only "tell the tale as 'twas told to me," but I tell of what I have myself seen and which I am unable to explain.

HARRY KELLAR.

A BIBLE LESSON FOR MR. HERBERT SPENCER

BY GAIL HAMILTON.

One hardly knows whether to be sorry or glad that Mr. Herbert Spencer has been caught napping. This gentle, modest Christian philosopher cannot create envy, but his attainments are so wide in scope, so far beyond the reach and the ambition of the commonalty that a solid bit of native ignorance in the midst of his learning does seem to humanize him—to bring him a little more within the sphere of our experience and sympathy.

At any rate Mr. Herbert Spencer has been caught napping, and napping, it must be confessed, in the very place where a good many of us have suspected he has been in the habit of going to sleep—with his head on the Bible! I have always maintained, in season and out of season, Mr. Spencer's orthodoxy, both for substance of doctrine and sweet reasonableness of statement, and have met some harmless jeers therefor; but I have never maintained that Mr. Spencer ranked himself as orthodox. The reason is plain. He has never gone deep enough into the Bible to know what orthodoxy really is! He apparently took his allotted share of Bible instruction along with the rest of his early routine education and stopped there, just as a great many inferior men have done; and if these men, with Mr. Spencer at their head, would let the Bible alone and stick to their *moutons* for vivisection, we would let them alone and stick to ours.

No universal obligation rests on men to be Biblical scholars any more than to be electricians. But, if being no electricians, they touch a live wire ignorantly, they are dead men. And when a student never so profound in any or all other departments would set a careless foot upon the science of sciences, Theology, as if that could be disposed of with a hop, skip, and jump, he must be gently and promptly put asi[illegible] with rubber gloves, just

to save his life, even though he be the beloved disciple who knows himself only as a Prophet of Evolution.

In the chapter on Veracity, in "The Principles of Ethics," Mr. Spencer executes a wild war dance before the other prophets and apostles. "We have proof in the Bible," he says, "that, apart from the lying which constituted false witness, and was to the injury of a neighbor, there was among the Hebrews but little reprobation of lying."

It might have been well here to note that the exception signified an immense advance on the other wild and semi-civilized tribes whom he cites. Of the Dakotas, of the Mishmis, of the Kirghis, of the Fijians, of the Ugandas, of the tribes of Central Asia, of Central America, of the Philippine Islands, whom he summons to the bar of moral judgment, he predicates no saving clause. Is it not worthy of note, if not of scientific investigation, that while all these tribes lied as a business enterprise, as a legitimate means of attack and defence, as the ordinary way of getting a living, one obscure tribe in Western Asia incorporated into their very earliest code a law forbidding *malicious* lying, injurious lying, false witness *against* a neighbor ? If we, in the nineteenth century, if we English and American citizens lived up to the standard held aloft by this half-civilized people, if we had completely abandoned the sort of lying which this tribe distinguished itself from its neighbors by reprobating—lying to the injury of a neighbor—a large part of the machinery of our civilization might be allowed to fall into disuse and our spears become tuning-forks to set our lives to a key of celestial harmony.

Mr. Spencer deduces from all his tribes the general observation that it is the presence or absence of despotic rule which tends to prevalent falsehood or prevalent truth ; that tribes which were subject to coercion lied as a matter of self-defence against their tyrants, while tribes that were governed by an elected council or by the majority of an assembly, and were inspired by the spirit of equality, were truthful, and that however annoying is the mendacity of free tribes, the mendacity of slave tribes far surpasses it.

But the Hebrew code, the great exceptional new law of truth, a law so high that we have not yet attained unto it, was made, adopted and observed by a race of slaves. Of all the tribes and people cited by Mr. Spencer for truth or for falsehood, savage or

semi-civilized, ancient or modern, Mexicans, Hindoos, Hottentots, Khonds, Kolîs, Bodo, Dhimáls, Todas, Hos, Puluyans, Wood-Veddahs, Ostiahs, Samoieds, Sontals, Bengalis, Kois, Râmôsîs, Saracens, Slavs, Avais, Aquitanians,—not one of them all has left any discernible mark upon us. Of many of them the name is not even known; while the one race of shepherd slaves has furnished, has at least fashioned, the backbone of our civilization. The code which it adopted when it came up out of four hundred years of slavery is the groundwork of our morality and our religion. It was wrought by the finger of God on tables of stone for the betterment of an ancient, semi-civilized, wandering tribe, according to their proud patriotic record. Mr. Herbert Spencer may scout the miracle, but he may see its continuous progress every Sunday morning, if he will walk into the churches of his own England; for, behold, the finger of God still writes on tables of stone the same ten commandments, fronting the great congregation, who still repeat them as devoutly as did the original Bedouins, with the earnest prayer, "Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law!"

It is not necessary to be a Congregationalist or an Episcopalian or an Agnostic, but this is a fact just as much as a serpent mound or a megatherium or an archæological potsherd. We may reject any and every particular philosophy of the fact, but the fact remains—to be accounted for.

This, assuming the truth of Mr. Spencer's statement, that with one exception "there was among the Hebrews but little reprobation of lying." The truth or falsity of that statement is not to my purpose. It is to my purpose that when Mr. Spencer brings forward his "proof from the Bible" to sustain his statement, he displays so very juvenile an acquaintance with his text-book that one is moved to go back indeed to the First Principles of Theology and ask him, tentatively: "Can you tell, my child, who made you?"

"Indeed, it would be remarkable were it otherwise," says Mr. Spencer, "considering that Jahveh set the example; as when, to ruin Ahab, he commissioned 'a lying spirit' (I Kings, xxii., 22) to deceive his prophets."

The passage which Mr. Spencer cited is this: "And the Lord said unto him, 'Wherewith'? And he said, 'I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets.' And he

said, 'Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also: go forth, and do so.'"

This is a "proof" just as much as many of the old "proof-texts" which used to be attached to our Sunday-school questions and answers were proof of the doctrines they were set against, but it is surprising to find it serving a scholar's purpose outside of Sunday-schools. It is a "proof" hardly more than the "top-knot, come down!" (Matt., xxiv., 17,) of the text-books was a proof that women are forbidden by Scripture to wear wired bows on their bonnets.

I quote the picturesque and spirited narrative from which Mr. Spencer deduces nothing but false witness against "a race-character which evolved such a conception of a deity's principles."

"And they continued three years without war between Syria and Israel. And the King of Israel said unto his servants: 'Know ye that Ramoth in Gilead is ours, and we be still, and take it not out of the hand of the King of Syria?'"—just as Bismarck, doubtless, spoke to Emperor William about Alsace and Lorraine in the hands of Louis Napoleon. "And it came to pass in the third year that Jehoshaphat, the King of Judah, came down to the King of Israel. And he said unto Jehoshaphat" (what every newspaper man in Europe is on the watch to hear the young German Emperor say when he goes a-visiting): "Wilt thou go with me to battle to Ramoth-gilead?" And as King Umberto might, in the enthusiasm of a strong and desired alliance, reply to William, Jehoshaphat answered the King of Israel: "I am as thou art, my people as thy people, my horses as thy horses."

And Jehoshaphat, who appears to have been a truly religious and orthodox man as far as policy would permit, and who liked to have the blessing of the clergy and the sentiment of the church with him in any enterprise, said to the King of Israel: "Inquire, I pray thee, at the word of the Lord to-day." Then the King of Israel—with the prompt alacrity of that ambitious colonel who, not willing to be outdone in anything, detailed forty men for baptism, to match the revival fruits in another regiment—gathered the prophets together, about *four hundred* men, and said unto them: "Shall I go against Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall I forbear?" And the servile crew who cared for nothing, but the buttered side of their bread in hand, and who knew well which side that was, answered to a man: "Go up; for the Lord shall

deliver it into the hand of the King." Jehoshaphat, familiar with true prophets, gave one look at the ragamuffin crowd, and showed what he thought of them by his first disgusted question to King Ahab: "Is there not here a *prophet of the Lord, besides,* that we might inquire of him?"

Not a word of defence for his rabble four hundred did the conscious Ahab proffer, but confessed judgment in his naïve reply: "There *is* yet one man, Micaiah the son of Imlah, by whom we may inquire of the Lord: but I hate him; for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil." And Jehoshaphat said gently: "Let not the King say so." And the King of Israel called an officer, and said: "Bring Micaiah here instantly!"

Eager to embrace every opportunity for displaying his magnificence, and hoping, no doubt, to overawe the one recalcitrant prophet, Ahab made a stately ceremonial of the occasion. The two kings put on their robes of state and splendor and sat each on his throne, which had been placed in a large open park at the entrance of the city for the better accommodation of the immense assembly. And all the prophets prophesied before them. And Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah, not content with the emphasis of reiteration, made himself horns of iron and accentuated his falseness by crying: "'Thus saith the Lord: 'With these shalt thou push the Syrians until thou hast consumed them.'" And all the fool prophets roared in emulous unison: "Go up to Ramoth-gilead and prosper: for the Lord shall deliver it into the King's hand."

And the messenger that was gone to call Micaiah, being very friendly towards the great, true man, and desirous of his welfare, spoke unto him, saying: "Behold, now, the words of the prophets declare good unto the King with one mouth; let thy word, I pray thee, be like the word of one of them and speak that which is good. What is the use of setting up one disagreeable truth against four hundred pleasant lies? You will only get yourself into trouble and benefit nobody. Let not my lord be always in a minority of one. It is simply throwing away your vote."

And Micaiah said: "As the Lord liveth, what the Lord saith unto me that will I speak." And his friend saw that Micaiah was impracticable and he held his peace. So he came to the King.

And when all the gates of etiquette had been duly passed, the

king said unto him in his most august manner, "Micaiah, shall we go against Ramoth-gilead to battle, or shall we forbear?" With a meaning glance at the friendly messenger who had advised compromise, and who stood near sorrowfully awaiting the result, Micaiah cried with ironical emphasis, assuming even the courtier tones of the pseudo-prophets: "Go and prosper; for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the King."

The King keenly felt and resented the mimicry which he was too clever not to see, and cried angrily to the bold prophet: "How many times shall I adjure thee that thou tell me nothing but that which is true in the name of the Lord?" A very pious exclamation, but Ahab must have forgotten what he had in a moment of frankness said to his visitor about the prophet.

And Micaiah, throwing off the mask of satire, said with the solemnity of foreboding: "I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have not a shepherd."

"Did I not tell them that he would prophecy no good concerning me, but evil," said the King, turning impatiently to his guest.

But Micaiah, not heeding the interruption, not permitting interruption, gazed upon the deluded people and the deluding priests, and upon the wayward king both deluded and deluding, and said in a voice that compelled attention, "Hear thou therefore the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on his throne and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, 'Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead?' And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said: 'I will persuade him.' And the Lord said unto him: 'Wherewith'? And he said, 'I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets.' And he said, 'Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also; go forth and do so.' Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee."

I know that I have spoiled the beauty of the old, old story, but Mr. Spencer compelled me to do so by refusing to understand it without a modern, not to say vulgar, pigment.

Who does not see in this an argument, a solemn warning in the guise of a parable, to dissuade a rash king from going out

to certain disaster? This is a story of Jahveh setting the example of lying! The whole burden of the tale is honor and reprobation of lying. "These men, prophets?" says the intrepid preacher in their very presence and in the presence of the allied kings: "Then they are the prophets of a lying spirit and not of the God of truth. These foul tongues divine? Then the Lord God Almighty has discarded His holy ones and has employed liars." It is an explanation, fanciful in form but embodying a real and deplorable truth. The incredible spectacle of four hundred pretended prophets leading a great king to his overthrow can be only by the inspiration of the devil.

Mr. Spencer does not understand it, but the four hundred understood. That Head Centre of falsehood, who could not be content with words, but must fashion to himself horrors of emphasis, understood.

Zedekiah, the son of Chenaanah, went near and smote Micaiah on the cheek and said with a bitter sneer: "Which way went the Spirit of the Lord from me to speak unto thee?" If Micaiah was simply telling them that Jahveh set them the example of lying, what was there for Zedekiah to be angry about? In those lying peoples among whom Mr. Spencer places the Hebrews, he tells us that a ready and clever liar is a valuable acquisition, that a successful liar is considered a smart, clever fellow, and rather admired, and that lying was tacitly or openly applauded. If then the Hebrew four hundred, lying as fast as their tongues could wag, under the stimulus of the kings' presence, who lived by their lies, were unexpectedly buttressed by the testimony of the great reformer justifying their lies by citing the example of Jahveh, why should Zedekiah have been moved to go up and slap his face?

What Mr. Spencer has done is to take out one item from a *reductio ad absurdum* in story form, the favorite form of a few thousand years ago, and state it as a categorical proposition—which he never would have done the second time if he had enrolled himself as a member in good and regular standing of our Washington Bible Class!

But he does it a second time, and a third time, time, times and a half. It is his stereotyped mode of "proof," his satisfactory exegesis. He slips down a thousand years and impales St. Paul on the same unthinking pen. "Nor do we find the stand-

ard much changed in the days of Christ and after ; instance the case of Paul, who, apparently rather piquing himself on his 'craft and guile,' elsewhere defends his act by contending that the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory" (Romans, iii., 7.).

Writing on the 8th of November I may not inaptly say that if Paul was the Republican Presidential candidate and Mr. Herbert Spencer a Democratic stump-speaker, I fear even his noble work in the past would not prevent partisan newspapers from describing him as the "Champion liar" of the campaign, which only shows how much harsher is political than theological debate, for Mr. Spencer is no liar, even when he does not speak the truth. If he is not a saint, he is, as old Father Taylor used to say of his son-in-law, a very sweet sinner. He does not misread Paul for the purposes of election or any self-seeking. He simply skims along the surface, assuming that there is nothing worth while under the surface. If he would give half the study to the Scriptures of the Jews that he gives to the Scriptures of the rocks he would not shoot so wide of the mark. If St. Paul had been a Mesozoic lizard Mr. Spencer would know all about him. But even as an exponent or sign-manual of evolution, Paul has a distinct and appreciable value, just as truly as if he were the *Anisichnus Deweyanus* gamboling on the micaceous sand a hundred and thirty feet below the earth's surface a hundred and thirty millions of years ago, and for that reason alone Mr. Spencer ought not to slur him over with such a twist of the pen !

Come hither, therefore, learned philosopher, sit down in our Bible class like a little child and learn that Paul did nothing of the sort. Obey the law of the half-civilized and cease to bear false witness against your neighbor, even though he be only a man and not a megalosaurus.

The early Christian Corinthians were very, very early Christians—just rescued from Paganism, always falling back and having to be pulled up again into a half decent Christianity by main force. In the present case they seem to have been slandering Paul right and left till his apostolic reputation and future influence were involved, and he was not simply stung but forced to a spirited self-defence. His natural Christian modesty and the necessity of proclaiming his integrity clashed, and now the one and now the other was uppermost.

"I am become a fool in glorying; ye have compelled me: for I ought to have been commended of you and not found fault with. For in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I am not one of the original twelve. Were not all the signs of an apostle wrought among you? What is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, I should like to know, except that I myself was not burdensome to you. You paid me no salary, as other churches do their ministers. Forgive me this wrong." Does Mr. Spencer need the explanation attached? "This is sarcasm."

"You say," continued Paul, "'Be it so, I did not burden you,' nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile. I did not receive a salary or take up a collection, but, being crafty, I got it out of you indirectly!

"How, will you please to tell me, did I make a gain of you by any of them whom I sent unto you? I desired Titus, and with him I sent a brother. Did Titus make a gain of you? Did Titus get any money out of you?

"Do not imagine I am excusing myself to you. I speak before God, in the name of Christ, and I am speaking for your sake that you may not make such fools of yourselves, such mean and petty and clamorous fools, that I shall be ashamed of you when I come, and shall have to rebuke you so sternly that you will hate me!"

And to read this Mr. Spencer lays aside not only his philosophical acumen, but his common understanding, and sits down like a stolid school-boy on the lowest bench and reads with the school-boy's unthinking, mechanical monotone, "And—be-ing craft-y, I-caught-you-with-guile." There would be just as much of Paul in his rendering if he read it backward: "Guile-with-you-caught-I-crafty-being-and."

He does precisely the same with the Romans. Paul considered himself eminently the Apostle to the Gentiles, not one of the original twelve, but a late comer, and therefore proper for the Gentiles, who were not the original "chosen people."

In many hand-to-hand fights he grappled with the Jews, maintaining and defending the right of his Gentiles to the Kingdom of Heaven—battling the Jewish claim to superiority and the exclusive possession of Divine favor. With his usual intellectual agility and dramatic tendency he takes both sides of the case and handles them with equal vivacity. Unhappily Mr. Spencer does not cut around corners fast enough to keep both Paul and his

imaginary antagonist always in sight, and comes to grief thereby. Seeing only Paul ahead he supposes Paul is making a dead straight line and must be talking to himself.

"Behold," says Paul, pouring forth his rapid and redundant eloquence on his bullet-headed Jews, "Thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a teacher of babes. Thou, therefore, which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? If you break every commandment in the Decalogue and the Gentile keeps every commandment, are you going to consider yourself a better man than the Gentile, simply because you are born a Jew? He is not a Jew which is one outwardly. He is a Jew which is one inwardly, obeying God in the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter.

"Do you say: 'What advantage, then, hath the Jew?' I answer: 'Much every way: chiefly because unto them were committed the oracles of God—these same commandments which you boast of holding, having received as a trust from God, yet which you spend your life in breaking. For what, if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? On the contrary, the faith of God often shines all the more strongly against the shadows of man's unbelief.'

"Ah! now you think you have caught me. Now you argue: 'If our unrighteousness illustrates the righteousness of God, we are doing a good work, and it is unrighteous in God to punish us for it.' God forbid! for then all wrong would have to go unpunished. 'Yes,' you persist,—for I speak as a man, as one of you,—'if the truth of God is all the clearer as seen against my lie, I maintain that my lie is a good thing, and I ought not to be judged a sinner because I tell it.'

"Oh, no! my beloved but erring brethren and hearers, wrong—all wrong. That is just what I am slanderously reported to teach, but what I earnestly repudiate and denounce—that it is right to do evil that good may come—that it is righteous to lie because God overrules it to the cause of truth. I teach nothing of the sort. I teach that the only right thing for Jew and Gentile alike is truth—is righteousness."

And this, this very self-same slanderous report which Paul flatly denies, Mr. Spencer blandly repeats, and repeats it on

Paul's authority! The acts which Paul vigorously disproves and condemns Mr. Spencer says that Paul defends. In the scorning and scoring of the Corinthian sophistry, Mr. Spencer sees only its adoption and use.

It is incredible that the great saint of the new departure in Judaism should be traduced by the great saint of modern evolution, when they ought to be brothers in unity. In point of real character I do not know that there is anything to choose. In certain very trying circumstances Mr. Spencer has shown himself a perfect Christian, and if I knew as much about him as I do about Saint Paul I dare say I should find him just as good—not so fiery in temperament, not so impetuous in style, not so irresistible in his current of thought or action (suppose the enthusiasm of investigation necessitates an entirely different mental constitution from the enthusiasm of humanity)—but just as single-hearted, just as truth-seeking in regard to the action of structure on function, as was Paul over the action of Jewish law on Gentiles.

But that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth also philosophers, even one thing befalleth them—the necessity of knowing what they are talking about. I abate no whit of positiveness regarding Mr. Spencer's orthodoxy as soon as Mr. Spencer thinks it worth his while to learn what orthodoxy is, or to render the Bible as accurately as he renders a bird track. But, until that happy hour arrives, so often as the ever-recurring question thunders down from the Spirit of Truth, Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge? thousands of his most ardent disciples will rise and answer, shame-faced, but unwavering, "Herbert Spencer, God bless him!"

GAIL HAMILTON.

OUR CITY VIGILANCE LEAGUE.

BY THE REV. DR. CHARLES H. PARKHURST.

THE principles and purposes of the above organization admit of being stated distinctly and concisely. Its origin dates primarily from the condition of public feeling excited by the presentment of the March Grand Jury of 1892. Prior to that there had been charges publicly brought against the Police Department, in particular, for criminality in discharge of its duties. There are certain statutory obligations resting upon that department which admit of no evasion, and disregard of which is as distinctly criminal as is the infraction of any law against murder or burglary.

The obligations thus specifically referred to are those summarized in Section 282 of the "Act of Consolidation," as follows:

> It is hereby made the duty of the police force, at all times of day and night . . . . . carefully to observe and inspect all places of public amusement, all places of business having excise or other licenses to carry on any business, all houses of ill-fame or prostitution, and houses where common prostitutes resort or reside; all lottery-offices, policy-shops, and places where lottery tickets or lottery policies are sold or offered for sale; all gambling-houses, cock-pits, rat-pits, and public common dance-houses, and to repress and restrain all unlawful and disorderly conduct or practices therein; enforce and prevent the violation of all laws and ordinances in force in said city; and for these purposes, with or without warning, to arrest all persons guilty of violating any law or ordinance for the suppression or punishment of crimes or offences.

Of that statute the procedure of the Police Department is a distinct and continuous violation. That is to say, in view of the existence of that statute, the Police Department of our city, from the top down, is permanently criminal. Whether the members of that department believe in suppressing the social evil, the gambling habit and violations of excise, has nothing to do with it. They are paid for enforcing the law, and for them to neglect

its enforcement on the ground that they think there is some wiser way of handling these evils, is an impertinence for which they deserve to be smartly rapped. Certain criminals the department will jump upon, and set its entire machinery in instant motion, in order to secure conviction, but it is itself more criminal than the criminals whom it nabs, for it makes a mockery of criminality by making a plaything of its obligations to suppress criminality, and by discriminating between criminals at the behest of considerations that are neither far nor hard to seek.

The public needs to be reminded of the following expression occurring in the presentment above referred to: "They enforce the law in many respects in a superior manner, but if they be permitted to discriminate in favor of certain forms of crime, for reasons well known to themselves, there is no telling where the same course will lead them to or land the interests of our city. Circumstances and testimony offered have tended to show financial considerations in some cases for lax administration. Indeed the publicity with which the law is violated and the immunity from arrest enjoyed by the law-breakers is inconsistent with any other theory."

Now that is substantially an indictment of the Police Department, and that indictment has not been met by the Department. Those of us who have been watching the course of events know that crime was just as rampant in this city the last two weeks before the first of December as it was during the last two weeks before the first of April. Now that is our one permanent point of assault.

If the writer of this article may be allowed a personal reference, there has been no effort made by him during the last ten months that has swerved a hair's breadth from the purpose to make police criminality in this respect a matter of general acquaintance and of public consciousness. We have not been dealing with the gambling habit. We have not been concerning ourselves with the social evil. We have no interest in the social evil as such. Our one unswerving purpose has been to show the community that the department, whose duty it is to lay a strong hand on these matters, is viciously negligent of its duty. And what is more we did show it, and that is why they hate us for it.

I have been thus detailed in my statement of the situation in order that it might be understood easily what is the scope of the

Society whose character and purposes I have been requested to set forth in this article. On taking up the work of the Society for the Prevention of Crime, somewhat more than a year ago, subsequent to the death of the deeply-lamented Crosby, we found ourselves confronted by a peculiar condition. The members of that Society were substantially of one mind in their conviction that, numerous as were the specific violations of crime in this city, there was another evil which we had to face, which was still more of a menace to our municipal character and weal. Violations of crime are bad enough, but they stand in no comparison with the peril of a condition of things whose very genius it is to gender violations of crime. Immediately on its re-organization the Society tackled that question.

The present president of the Society stated at that time that he would have no interest in throwing himself into the work if it was to be confined to the prosecution of specific infractions of statute. It was decided that the duty immediately before us was to antagonize the existing relations between municipal authorities and criminals which made crime easy and secured to it immunity. Pursuant to that end we avail ourselves of such means as are at hand for securing and giving publicity to the evidences of an unholy compact between those who commit crime and those whose prime duty it is to prevent its commission. That, then, is the immediate purpose of the Society for the Prevention of Crime.

Now that Society and the City Vigilance League are concentric. The members of the latter might be termed associate members of the former. They have the same president. They have the same axial purpose. They might be designated as being the inner and the outer circles of the same organization. We have the same rooms as our headquarters. One and the same man is the secretary of the two. Religiously and politically we have the same platform. That platform is made broad enough for any man to stand upon who believes in pure municipal government, whether he be Protestant, Catholic or Jewish, and whether his affiliations be with the Democratic, or the Republican party, or with Tammany Hall.

The perfect coincidence in point of scope between the two organizations puts us in a position to meet the charge which has been brought against the League that it is a spying organization.

It is a spying organization in exactly the same sense that the Society for the Prevention of Crime, in the pursuit of its present purposes, is a spying organization. We have ample ground for suspecting the honesty of conduct of a good many of our municipal servants, and in view of the fact that they are our servants we are watching them. We are not watching the community at large. Though we had a member of the League posted on every block, that would not alter the case at all. We have a considerable number of municipal servants in our employ, whose salaries are being paid out of our pockets ; we suspect these servants, some of them, of not doing what they are paid for doing, and we are watching them to discover evidences of their infidelity. Now if that kind of watching is what our enemies choose to call "spying," they are welcome to the term, although, of course, we understand perfectly well that they select that designation for the reason that they know that their own behavior is iniquitous, and therefore desire to discredit and render unpopular any scheme designed to embarrass their crooked practices. The one principle by which we are animated is that these officials are our hired servants, and as such it is part of our civic responsibility to look after them, and the more they resent that idea and call it names, the more evident it becomes that they need looking after. If a man is at the head of any ordinary business and suspects any of his employees of a mischievous use of any of his own funds he does not consider that he is "playing the spy" upon them if he keeps a shrewd eye upon their operations so far as those operations have to do with his business and his money. The fraudulent employee would probably call it "spying," but nobody else would think of doing so.

One object which we have had in view in enlisting in this work a large number of men, especially in young and middle life, is to inculcate exactly that idea, that there is a responsibility for these matters lodged in us *as citizens*. We are not going to be safe here in this city till there comes to be among us a general recognition of the fact that citizenship entails responsibility, and not a responsibility that is discharged by the occasional dropping of a ballot at election, but a responsibility that survives election and that follows the citizen all the way round the year till the next election comes. We here in New York are in the sad condition in which we find ourselves to-day for the reason that we have to

such a degree relegated municipal responsibilities to our official subordinates that they have become practically irresponsible parties, and instantly resent the idea of being called to account. They have come to stand to us in very much the same relation that domestic servants often stand in towards their mistresses, who by being left for a little time too much to their own behests acquire the idea that they are themselves the mistresses, resent as vicious interference anything in the way of rebuke or criticism, even though emanating from the employers who pay their monthly wages.

The City Vigilance League has been established then in part as a means of inculcating on our younger men a sense of civic responsibility. In our meetings together, we are not accustomed to mention the Mayor or the District Attorney or the Superintendent of Police or any other official with bated breath. We never mean to be disrespectful or insolent; but our deliberations are conducted in distinct recognition of the fact that they are paid by us to do our municipal business for us, and as such that it becomes us to handle them in their paid relations to us with the same frankness precisely as that with which Mr. Smith handles the clerk in his offices, or that with which Mrs. Jones handles Bridget in the kitchen.

Of course such doctrine as this is not congenial to the parties in office, but, then, that is their concern, not ours; but we trust that in time they will become so accustomed to it as to treat it with a little more suavity than seems natural to them just at present. No matter how many municipal officials we have, this is still *our city*. The Mayor is bound to look after the citizens, but the citizens are just as much bound to look after the Mayor. The Judiciary must sit on the bench, but the citizens must sit on the Judiciary. There is no man so faithful that he does not need to be watched in order to be kept faithful. I mention these facts, because they constitute a part of the catechism of each City Vigilance Leaguer. These principles, it seems to the members of the League, none can resent or criticise, except such as desire to serve their city for the sake of the pecuniary dividend there is in it.

Another point emphasized among the members of the League is that citizens in order to fulfil their civic functions in the midst of a depraved and ill-governed city must become intensely con-

scious and frankly assertive of the authority properly inhering in them in their civil capacity. One man with the right on his side, and knowing that the right is on his side, is quite a crowd. Mere arithmetical proportions do not signify, any more than in the instance of a crowd versus one hornet; if the hornet is feeling well and his works are in good repair, the size of the crowd is the very last thing that comes into account. Everything pivots on the hornet.

We have stated the circumstances out of which the League grew and the principles by which it is animated; it will be in order now to say something as to the specific work which it is doing. In attempting to apprise the community of the delinquencies, to use no harsher term, of the existing muncipal administration, the only enginery we can bring to bear is facts.

So far forth the City Vigilance League may be considered as an organization for the gleaning of facts tending to certify the community of the fidelity or infidelity of its public officials. General as is the conviction that things in this city are not what we have the right to expect them to be, there is not that detailed knowledge of the situation that is needed in order that the matter may come home with power and effect to the intelligence and the conscience of the community at large. It is that situation precisely that creates the necessity for such an organization as the League. We have no politics. Our only ambition is thoroughly to know our city, and to make the facts that relate to its character and administration perfectly perspicuous to the average mind, regardless of all partisan or sectarian differences.

Our preliminary need is of 1,137 men, honest and durable, who will undertake to represent respectively each of the election districts into which our city is at present subdivided. The duty of each of those men will be to make himself thoroughly conversant with all that concerns the district under his charge. So far as in any way bears upon questions at issue he must know his district through and through. It is recommended, in order to insure thoroughness, that each supervisor should prepare a chart of his own district, with the names of residents so fast as he may come to know their names, nationality, etc. Buildings used for other than purposes of residence should be considered in detail, and their character noted so far as such memoranda can be of any use in securing the results already specified This will include schools and saloons, a full account of which later will embrace such par-

ticulars as the brewer under whose auspices the saloon is run, the general tone of the place, the relations subsisting between it and the policeman on the beat or the captain of the precinct; whether it is kept open in unlawful hours, the age and character of its customers, whether it is licensed, and if so whether its existence is necessitated by the paucity of saloons in the neighborhood or whether people living in proximity are enduring its presence under protest. The survey and tabulation must of course include a statement as to all houses of prostitution, pool-rooms, policy-shops and gambling-houses in the district.

In this connection it ought to be said that it is emphatically urged upon supervisors that nothing should be done by them that can be any moral menace to them or that can put taint even upon their reputation. So far as relates to the gleaning of this class of facts the Society for the Prevention of Crime and its detectives can be employed. Everything relating to the condition of the streets will also come under the purview of supervisors, such as their cleanliness, the condition of the paving, and in cases where paving is being laid, whether it is being laid according to the terms of the contract. The above specifications, although not comprising all the lines of work contemplated, will suffice to illustrate the spirit and intent of the League, which is that wherever the administrative blood beats in this city the finger of the League shall be upon it counting its pulsations.

The work of gathering in the required number of supervisors is being carefully but energetically pushed. There are at present thirty assembly districts in the town. When our organization is complete each of these assembly districts will have its assembly supervisors, and will be thereby constituted president of the district supervisors comprised within that assembly district. There will thus be thirty subordinate organizations, which will all be comprised within one comprehensive organization through the agency of the managing committee of thirty assembly supervisors. We are not crowding things with inordinate haste but are trying to take the careful measure of each new man we receive. We are most of us in early or middle life, and hope to be spared to a good many years of active and useful service.

C. H. PARKHURST.

POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AND ENGLAND.

BY THE RIGHT HON. JAMES BRYCE, M. P., AUTHOR OF "THE AMERICAN COMMONWEALTH."

ALTHOUGH democratic governments not only existed, but were copiously discussed by political philosophers, more than two thousand years ago, the world has as yet had very little experience of the rule of numbers as applied to large populations. Switzerland and Norway, no less than the republics of antiquity, of the middle ages, furnish data of comparatively little service to great nations like Germany and Italy, for democracy in small communities is evidently quite a different thing from what it is in large ones. France has been democratic only since 1871, England only since the two great Franchise Extension and Redistribution Acts of 1884 and 1885. Thus it is only in the United States that the problem of governing a great state by the vote of large masses of men has been worked out with any approach to completeness, and those who in the old world seek to forecast the course of their own popular governments must look for light beyond the Atlantic. This is especially the case as regards the organization of political parties. No one has yet written the natural history of parties, though Burke has some admirable reflections upon the uses and dangers of this kind of government. No one of the best-known European authorities on political science, such as Tocqueville in the last generation, or Bluntschli, Schérer, Bagehot and Laveleye in our own, has recognized the importance of the part which is played in large democracies by what may be called the mechanism of the parties.

Party government is a species of war, conducted by ballots instead of bullets. The efficiency of the contending hosts de-

pends hardly less on their discipline than on their numbers, because scattered voting is even worse than scattered firing. A small party which is cohesive and obeys its leaders will prevail in a campaign, if not in a battle, against a larger party which breaks into fractions. This has been forcibly brought home to people in England by the recent general election, in which the Tory party did not lose a single seat by internal divisions, while the two allied oppositions, British and Irish, had, both, to regret defeats, owing to the drawing off by rival candidacies of large groups of voters.

Before proceeding to comply with the request made to me to furnish some account of party organizations of Great Britain as compared with those of the United States, it is well to account for the rudimentary character of the former. Some American readers may fancy that our British backwardness is due to a deficient interest in political strife. So far is this from being the case that there has never been a time when political interest was keener than from 1876 till now; nor has any election since 1832 been fought with as much fierceness as that which is closing as I write (July, 1892). The causes why party organizations have been less developed in the United Kingdom may be best understood by noting what are the causes which have stimulated their creation and extension in the United States.

I. In the United States the number of elections is very great, vastly exceeding that to be found in any European country. The system of urban and rural local government which prevails over the Eastern, Middle, and Western States, requires the election of many representative bodies for areas of all sizes; while the practice of choosing executive officers by popular vote instead of having them, as in Europe, nominated either by the central government or by the local representative council, still further increases the occasions on which the people are called upon to declare by ballot their preferences. The federal structure of the government adds another set of assemblies to those which European countries (except federal Switzerland) require, with another set of elections. Moreover, in America, representatives and officials are usually chosen for short periods, so that the occasions for choosing them occur very frequently. Hence the need for keeping a party together for fighting purposes is a need continuously felt, a need which not only obliges the organization to

be always "on a war footing," but gives it that dexterity and exactness of drill which come from unintermitted practice.

II. In the United States, while there are incessant elections for small areas, such as city wards and townships, there are also elections where the area is very large and the number of voters enormous—such as the elections of State officers and of congressmen. Nothing but an active and well-built organization can manipulate these huge masses, and turn them from a mob into an army.

III. Over the greater part of the United States the lines of political party do not coincide with those of class distinction, or of any other kind of distinction, such as trade or religion. Party, therefore, cannot avail itself of such other forms of social or economic organization as may exist, but must create fresh ones for its own purposes. Moreover a large proportion of the population is new to the country and its institutions, ignorant, migratory. It will vote wildly, or will not vote at all, unless it is seized, enlisted, drilled by the recruiting agents and inferior officers of the party machinery.

Compare with these conditions those of Great Britain.

In Great Britain elections are comparatively few. The only one which excites much political interest, that for the House of Commons, comes on an average but once in four years. Elections for city councils, county councils, and even school boards, are now beginning to be fought upon party lines, but the first was seldom a party affair till some twenty or thirty years ago, while school boards date only from 1870, county councils from 1888. Thus both the need for machinery to handle voters and the opportunities for working that machinery have been comparatively slender. When a parliamentary election came round, a system of committees sprang into being to meet the emergency; but when the emergency had passed the committees were dissolved, and the organization practically went to pieces. It is not yet clear whether the interposition between parliamentary elections of the minor ones just referred to will do much to keep the party machinery in a state of constant readiness for work.

In Great Britain the masses of voters to be manipulated have till recently been, on an average, small. Even now few parliamentary constituencies exceed twelve thousand voters, while many are below eight thousand, numbers manageable by extemporized committees.

In Great Britain the people are not only far more settled in their dwelling-places than in America, but are grouped and organized by a variety of social, religious, and economic bonds which scarcely exist in the newer parts of the latter country. The influence of rank counts for something, that of wealth for a vast deal. Employers, if they have any tact, are often able to carry their workers with them, and may venture to appeal to, or even put pressure on, the latter in a way which American opinion would not tolerate.

So the clergy of not a few denominations interfere in politics. Those of the Established Churches of England and Scotland have been active of late years on the Tory side. English Nonconformist ministers occasionally appear on the platforms of the other party, while in Ireland the Episcopalian and Presbyterian ministers in Ulster seem at the recent election to have rivalled the Roman Catholic priests of the southern provinces in their political exertions. Thus voters can be moved in many other ways than by purely political machinery, and the parties find ready made to their hand in the influences of land-owners and capitalits, or industrial magnates, or ecclesiastics, methods of swaying the constituencies often more effective than the regular party associations. Nor must it be forgotten that the issues upon which most of our British parliamentary contests have been fought, have been clearer and sharper issues than those raised between the two great American parties since 1868, and have in many cases turned upon the extension of the political privileges of the masses. The people have been so excited by questions touching themselves directly, as to need the stimulus of party methods far less than has usually happened in the United States, at least since the election of 1868.

However, the most important difference between the two countries lies in this, that in Great Britain there are extremely few persons who have any direct personal interest, affecting their pocket or their status, involved in the victory or defeat of a party. Setting aside the holders of, and aspirants to, the thirty or forty places which change hands with the ministry of the day, and the somewhat larger but still quite insignificant number of persons who hope for those few posts in the permanent civil service which remain within the free patronage of ministers, or who seek to become peers or baronets, there is nobody to whom it makes any pecuniary difference which party is in power. Hence, whoever

works for his party works disinterestedly, and can seldom afford to give more than a small part of his time to the work. We have in England no paid political workers, except the secretaries of the political associations, and they are paid just the same whether their party is in or out. How different things are in the United States, and what have been the results of the spoils system there, everybody knows. It cannot be doubted that the completeness and effectiveness of the party machine there is largely due to the fact that it commands the service of so great a number of men who have a direct money interest in the success of their party.

Americans who weigh the considerations, and perceive how different are the conditions of politics in the two countries, will not be surprised to find the organization of parties in Great Britain far less perfect than in America. It is also worth remarking that although the main aim of every organization is to win elections, this aim is pursued in different ways in the United States and in Great Britain. In the United States the efforts of those who work are concentrated on the selection of candidates and the getting hold of voters. In Great Britain, on the other hand, while the latter object is supremely important, the selection of candidates has not hitherto demanded great exertions. Much attention has had to be given to the registration ; that is, to seeing that duly qualified voters of one's own side are put upon the voting roll and non-qualified opponents are struck off. Probably we in Great Britain devote relatively more pains to political education, not only by distributing pamphlets and leaflets, but also by arranging meetings and lectures.

In the United States the system is complete and symmetrical from top to bottom. The smallest local area which elects a representative or an executive officer has its party meetings in which each party nominates its candidate, and has also a working committee for conducting the election. So in each voting area forming part of some larger area for which a representative or an executive officer is to be chosen, the party meeting (primary) sends its delegates to the Convention or meeting of persons representing the party in that larger area. This Convention nominates the party candidate and chooses the committee which is to work the election. For every electing area, except the smallest, there is a Convention, from that which nominates candidates for city office or county office up to the gigantic national conventions

which nominate the party candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the United States. Everybody who sits in a Convention sits as a delegate, that is to say, he has been sent to sit there by the choice of other persons in a primary meeting or in a Convention of a lower degree. Thus the system is strictly representative. It is intended to enable the people themselves to determine the persons for whom votes are to be cast, as well as the managers who are to run the election campaign. And in being representative it has two advantages. It enjoys an authority, that of the people themselves, which no self-constituted body could enjoy, and it enables the primary meeting which chooses the delegates to a Convention to instruct those delegates in favor of the person whom they are to endeavor to get selected as candidate, so as thereby to give effect to the wishes of the party as a whole.

The British system, though far simpler and rougher, is harder to describe, because it varies from place to place, and is still in a fluid state. Till recently we had in Great Britain no regular local party organizations for selecting candidates or for fighting elections. Everything was left either to the central office in London of each of the two great parties, or else to the candidates themselves. Sometimes the central office sent down a candidate, perhaps aiding him with money, to fight a borough. More frequently the candidate himself appeared on the scene, called on the leading men, and, if he saw a fair chance of success, issued his address, hired a committee-room, got some people to act as his committee, but practically worked the election by his agent. If the constituency was a county, it was almost a matter of course that the candidate should own property in the county and reside part of the year there; nor could any one have much chance of success unless he had been approved by the leading country gentlemen belonging to his own party.

Some forty years ago things began to change in the boroughs, and the change has now extended even to the counties, having been greatly accelerated by the Redistribution Act of 1885, which cut the counties up into manageable electoral divisions of (approximately) 8,000 to 15,000 voters each. In every borough there is now a Liberal and a Conservative (or "Constitutional") Association, which is deemed to represent the party for all purposes within the area of the constituency. To it belong the functions (*a*) of looking after the registration, though in practice this

is often undertaken by the agent of the sitting member on one side and of the prospective candidate on the other; (*b*) of conducting the political education of the voters by holding meetings; and (*c*) of selecting candidates. I do not include the work of fighting the elections, because, when the tug of war comes, the association, or rather its permanent executive committee, usually stands aside to make way for the candidate and his agent and the election committee specially formed for the occasion. As respects the selection of a parliamentary candidate, this is a matter which excites a good deal of interest when the field is vacant—*i. e.*, when the sitting member desires to retire, or when the candidate who fought for the defeated party at the last preceding election does not wish to try his luck again. It is unusual to reject the person actually in possession of the field from the last contest, partly because he is supposed to have an advantage in the fight, as being already known and himself knowing the ways of the place, partly because there is an unwillingness to do anything that savors of discourtesy to one who has established personal relations with the leading local men.

Two instances occurred the other day which illustrate this attitude. In an important borough a sitting Tory member had displeased his party, not by his opinions, but (it would seem) by want of tact. In order to get rid of him the local association had to invite both the members (it was one of our few remaining two-membered constituencies) to retire. Both consented, whereupon the association promptly re-invited one of them whose popularity had never been questioned, leaving the other member out in the cold. In the other case a member who had sat for some fifteen years for a borough had irritated the more advanced section of his party by a backward and, as they thought, too cautious attitude. The party became split up over the question of retaining him at the general election. Few approved of his votes, but there was so general a respect for his character that the officials of the association stuck by him, though many of the rank and file fell away, and set up a Radical candidate against him. Both he and the Radical went to the poll, with the result that a Tory got in, though by a vote little more than half of that which was wasted upon the two contending Liberals.

Such cases, which could scarcely occur in America, show how strong is the aversion to throw over a person who has once

obtained a hold; and it may be said generally that the renomination of a sitting member is in nine cases out of ten a mere matter of form, and even more so among the Tories than among the Liberals.

When, however, the field is clear, considerable pains are taken to get a suitable person. If there is a good local man—rich, popular, and a ready speaker—he will be preferred. If none such appears, or if he excites the jealousy of some section, then aspirants from without come down to reconnoitre. Frequently a deputation of leading men in the local association goes to the central office in London (whereof more anon) to learn there what available men the party managers have on their books. Probably two or three, possibly four or five, are invited to interview the committee or to address a meeting of the association. When the association has heard them, a vote is taken to decide who shall be adopted. So lately as fifteen years ago it was thought scarcely compatible with the dignity of a man aspiring to sit in Parliament to submit himself in this way to the judgment of the electors, instead of waiting till they had by a requisition invited him to do them the honor of representing them. But all that is changed now, and the dignity of a member of Parliament—or, at least, the old-fashioned conception of it—has vanished. The grounds on which a candidate is selected are much the same in Great Britain and in America. Local influence counts for a good deal, though probably less than two-thirds of the members of the present House of Commons are locally connected with the places they sit for. Character and talent are pretty fairly estimated; wealth is an important factor in constituencies where subscriptions are expected or where a contest is costly. Seldom is a selection complained of as obtained by unfair means; nor do I recollect any instance in which it was even alleged that an aspirant had used money to obtain a nomination.

American readers will ask how the local party associations or their directing councils are constituted, and whether no difficulties are found in securing a fair election of delegates. British practice in these matters is so loose and unsettled that it is not easy to give a view which is at once precise and generally applicable. As a rule, however, anybody who likes can join a Conservative or Liberal Association, a small subscription being in theory expected, but in fact often dispensed with. No proof is required

that the person joining belongs to the party, beyond his own declaration. If he voted on the other side and professes to have now come round, so much the better; he is welcomed as a convert. Where the system is most regularly arranged, as in Birmingham and those constituencies which have followed the Birmingham pattern, the association is organized by wards, and in every ward a meeting is held annually of the members registered in that ward, at which delegates are chosen to the general council of the association. These meetings are usually thinly attended, and little or no controvery arises over the choice of delegates. Only in those rare cases in which there are two factions supporting the claims of two rival aspirants for the party nomination does each faction beat up its supporters and try to carry its own list of delegates. Even when this happens, one hears no suggestions of foul play. Such as it is, our local caucus machinery is free from any taint of corruption or trickery; and the idea of having to pass statutes in order to secure the fair conduct of primaries and nominating conventions, as it has been found neces sary to do in several American States, would excite amazement in Great Britain, where all party meetings are deemed to be private affairs, and have indeed possessed too little importance to be worth capturing. Were security for their honest management needed, it would be found in the fact that the slightest suspicion either of bullying or of fraud would destroy the credit of the association and its nominee in the eyes of the party generally. As it is, the mass of voters pay no great deference to the association. If a sitting member were to lose his renomination, owing to the intrigues of a rival who had won over the majority of the association's council, he might, if popular with the party as a whole, defy the council and his rival, and he would probably get a larger number of votes at the election. But as such a split would probably involve the loss of the seat to the other party, things scarcely ever go so far. Pressure is put by the leading local men, or perhaps by the central office, upon the rivals, until some compromise is arranged under which one or other aspirant retires from the field.

Often, however, the council of the association is not thus constituted by a regular scheme of ward elections, but is chosen by a general meeting of the association. The strength and authority of a council, howsoever chosen, consist not in its repre-

sentative character, but in the men that compose it, their zeal, their ability, their local influence, and, to some extent, their wealth also, especially in places where (as in Lancashire) it is the custom for the rich members of the party to subscribe towards the election expenses of a candidate.

One may indeed say that all through our British system the material element prevails over the formal. It is not the rules, but the actual forces, that count. So long as a strong candidate is secured, on whom the party will unite, nobody cares much about the manner in which he has been selected. The complications that arise seldom spring from a disregard of forms, still less from tricks and devices, but from the difficulty of reconciling the claims of various sections of the party. Among the Tories there are seldom sections of opinion; it is the personal jealousies of influential men that give trouble. Among the Liberals, however, the working classes have sometimes been at variance with the wealthier sort, and found the latter reluctant to adopt workingmen as candidates, while occasionally the temperance men have refused to support any candidate who does not go the full length of their programme. Now, however, practically every Liberal candidate goes for restriction of the liquor traffic, and the claims of the workingmen to a substantial representation by members of their own class are generally conceded.

The preceding observations refer to parliamentary candidates only. It is still harder to treat of the choice of candidates for town councils, county councils, and school boards, for our practice is still less settled. In some districts these elections have little to do with the party lines of demarcation. Candidates offer themselves for election on their personal merits and conduct, irrespective of party organizations. In other districts the organization helps the candidate, placing its rooms at his disposal, and furnishing volunteer canvassers. In others, again—and this is a steadily increasing practice—the ward council of the party chooses the ward candidate for a town council, and if the county electoral division happens to have a party association or party council, that association or council will choose the candidate for county counsellor. In the case of towns, however, the association (or its executive committee) for the whole town will usually conduct the election, raising the funds and managing the canvass.

To complete the above account, it must be added that in the counties, and especially in the agricultural county districts, as opposed to those in which there is a manufacturing or mining population, party organization is less complete than in the towns, and the influence of land owners and large employers of labor is proportionately greater. The rural districts are, in fact, much less democratized than the cities. So, too, party organizations are more perfect in England than in Scotland or Ireland. In Scotland the Liberal party has hitherto enjoyed a marked preponderance. The people are, as a rule, better educated, and the spirit of party, simply as party, has less power than in South Britain. It is a trifling, but significant, illustration of this difference that party colors, universal in England, are little used in Scotch elections. In Ireland, on the other hand, religion creates so strong a line of demarcation that it is hardly worth while to take trouble in building up secular party organizations. In five-sixths of the island the Home Rulers have so overwhelming a majority that they do not really require a system of local councils and committees. In the other sixth, where Roman Catholics and Protestants are pretty evenly balanced, party feeling has lately run so high, and the ministers of religion and the local leaders have been so active, that such a system can be dispensed with. Nowhere in the United Kingdom has so large a proportion of the voters come to the polls as in these Ulster constituencies.

As the account given above refers primarily to the Liberal party, it must be qualified by the remark that among the Conservatives the councils of associations less frequently than among the Liberals purport to be created by the election of delegates, the so-called "Birmingham system" having been rarely adopted; that in many county divisions no regular Conservative associations exist, and that everywhere, though more markedly in the counties than in the towns, the influence of local magnates, peers, landowners, wealthy brewers, or manufacturers is greater among the Tories than among the Liberals. This is partly because such magnates are mostly Tories, partly because the tone of the Tory party is still much less democratic. Yet the tendency is towards a popular and representative organization. Just as the Liberal party has begun to follow, though at a long distance, the American system of organization, so the Tories are following, with steps still slow,

yet daily quickening, the Liberal model. Wherever there is a substantial Tory party there now exists the germ of a Tory representative caucus. Rough and irregular it may be, for there is often a sort of ring of aristocratic proclivities which selects the candidates and "runs" the party. Yet the ring goes through the form of obtaining the confirmation of some popular body professing to be representative of the rank and file; and, as the influence of the latter increases, so does that of the former decrease. In cities and in thickly populated country districts the popular control is felt and the popular sentiment "placated" by the party leaders. And although the Tory party is still much more docile and more cohesive than its rival, its temper has so largely changed during the last twenty years, that in another twenty years more it may have become as democratic, both in its methods and in its programme, as the Radical party of to-day. Of the two smaller parties—the Irish Nationalists and the "Dissentient" or "Unionist" Liberals—it is hardly necessary to speak, for the phenomena they represent are quite exceptional, and may probably prove transitory.

So far of the local party associations, councils, and committees. It remains to say a word upon those larger party organizations which exist for the country as a whole. There is nothing in Great Britain to correspond to a State Convention or to a State Executive or Campaign Committee, because we have no divisions larger than counties. Both Liberals and Tories have, however, their central offices in London, and each has a sort of confederation of the local party associations, called respectively the "National Liberal Federation" and the "National Union of Conservative Associations." These two bodies have each of them an annual conference, held in some large town, and consisting of delegates sent up by the various local associations. They are the nearest parallel we have to the National Conventions of the United States, but are far less important, because they select no candidate, and, indeed, do no business beyond making speeches and passing resolutions embodying the platform of the party. Such resolutions derive their importance, moreover, not from being passed at these meetings, but from their acceptance by the responsible chiefs of the party: and the value of a conference lies chiefly in the enthusiasm which it is supposed to generate, and in the opportunities which it furnishes to the par-

liamentary leaders of making the acquaintance of locally influential and zealous members of the party.

The central offices of the parties are charged with a general oversight of party interests, and especially with four duties, the compilation and diffusion of party literature, the raising of funds for party purposes and allotment of them to constituencies where they are needed, the sending down parliamentary orators to public meetings, and the provision of candidates to constituencies which cannot find candidates for themselves. In the case of the Liberal Central Office, which is worked along with the permanent secretariate of the National Liberal Federation, this function of suggesting candidates is sparingly and cautiously exercised, with a careful regard to local susceptibilities. Where the party in a constituency has got a good local man, it is left to itself. It is only when it asks to have candidates suggested for its consideration, or when some local dissension arises which needs to be removed in the interests of party harmony, that it ventures to send a candidate or offer mediation. It has only a moral authority, which it retains by showing tact and impartiality.

A strange idea has got abroad, and been propagated by some who might know better, that these offices, and especially the secretariate of the National Liberal Federation, are the seats of a secret and despotic power, which holds all the local associations in thralldom, nominates its own candidates over the whole country, frames the programme of the party, and compels every candidate to swallow it; and, to use a colloquial expression, "bosses" the party at large. No conception could be more absolutely wide of the truth. Neither candidates nor local associations are in any way dependent on or subservient to this so-called "Liberal Caucus." The candidate has to reckon with his party in the constituency, and with them only; the local party is master of its own organization, and that organization need have nothing to do with the central office unless it pleases. What really binds the party together is their attachment to the leader, zeal for certain party principles or party proposals, and that indefinable thing we call party spirit. The same remark holds generally true of the Tories also, save that the Tory party is far more influenced by its peers and other magnates. Its structure is more oligarchic, and it is, therefore, a more compact and well-drilled fighting force, in proportion to its numbers.

Both our great British parties profess to be dissatisfied with their organizations; both exhort their followers to stricter discipline, as well as to more active coöperation in local political work. So far as party associations and clubs tend to stimulate a knowledge of politics and honest thinking about them, they do good; and it is also a gain that when an election arrives the greatest possible number of voters should be brought to the polls. Nor does there seem to be danger that Great Britain will see, as the United States has seen, selfish rings in cities gaining the control of the party machinery and working it to their own sinister purposes, because we have a permanent civil service, and scarcely any paid offices conferred by direct popular vote. It is personal pecuniary interest, rather than political passion, that makes the party machine so dangerous in free governments.

Nevertheless it may be doubted whether British politics will gain by that more elaborate and effective organization of party forces which has been in progress among us and seems destined to grow still further in strength. Party is, after all, only a means to an end, and must not be suffered to become an end in itself; while the attempt to drill a party too rigidly has sometimes the effect of driving independent men out of political work altogether. There is, moreover, a sense in which it may truly be said that the more of party organization the less of the free play of public opinion. It is desirable that there should be in the country a large proportion of persons who, while watching politics intelligently and alive to the duty of voting at every election, are not so blindly attached either to their chiefs, or to their party traditions and prejudices, as to be unable to deal at each election with both parties on the merits, throwing their weight on this side or on that according to the character of the leaders as well as to the nature of the issues involved. Nothing else keeps the parties in order.

It is no small gain to the government of a great state that the judgment pronounced by the nation at a general election should be a broad and decisive judgment, expressed in a strong majority for one or other policy and party. And this result is more apt to be secured when there remains a large number of those who, looking to principles and performance, refuse to be dominated by mere party machinery.

JAMES BRYCE.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

FARM AND HOME PROPRIETORSHIP.

HOME-OWNING in the United States is the subject of investigation by the Eleventh Census, and the results already published are sufficient to indicate the extent to which it prevails, and whether it is increasing or diminishing in relation to the growth of population. The family is adopted as the statistical unit, and each family is accounted for as cultivating a farm, or as occupying a home not on a farm, and, again, as hiring or as owning the farm or home.

Of the farm families in the District of Columbia, 37.47 per cent. hire the farms they cultivate; in Georgia, 58.10 per cent.; In Iowa, 29.57 per cent.; in Maine, 7.62 per cent.; in Maryland, 37.23 per cent.; in Massachusetts, 15.06 per cent.; in Montana, 13.40 per cent.; and in New Jersey, 32.11 per cent.

Statistics in similar form for home families show that 74 80 per cent. of the total number of home families in the District of Columbia hire the homes that they occupy; 79.00 per cent. in Georgia; 41.96 per cent. in Iowa; 51.98 per cent. in Maine; 68.13 per cent. in Maryland; 67.23 per cent. in Massachusetts; 56.30 per cent. in Montana; and 68.07 per cent. in New Jersey.

The foregoing percentages permit the inference that more than one-half of the families of the United States, and in the South and East two-thirds of the families, are landless. It is improbable that a considerable proportion of the tenants of farms and homes own any land. Upon combining the farm and home tenant families, it is found that they are 68.57 per cent. of the total number of families in Georgia; 36.82 per cent. in Iowa; 33.65 per cent. in Maine; 61.81 per cent. in Maryland; 63.51 per cent. in Massachusetts; 46.25 per cent. in Montana; and 64.34 per cent. in New Jersey. That is to say, the landless families in these States are proportions of the total number of families probably not much less than the percentages immediately preceding.

The first statistics of farm tenure in the United States are contained in the census report on agriculture for 1880. The unit was the farm and not the farm family, as in the investigation of farm and home proprietorship in 1890, but the difference does not prevent a reasonably safe comparison. In all these States farm tenancy has proportionately increased, the greatest increase being from 44.85 to 58.10 per cent. in Georgia, and the least from 4.32 to 7.62 per cent. in Maine. The explanations of this increase will have a wide range. On the one hand it will be said that the tariff, the gold standard of value, the growth of natural and artificial monopolies and a relative increase of the poorer class, are responsible for this result; and on the other hand that it is a result of the superior inducements of trade, manufactures, the professions and town life, a reaction from a low cultivation of large farms, the unwillingness of women to do farm housework, and partly the effect of agricultural over-production.

Statistics do not show the previous condition of the tenants, but from

observation it may be said that in the South most of them were formerly slaves and that in other parts of the country they are partly farmers who have been reduced from ownership and partly former farm-laborers who worked for wages and have since been elevated to tenant proprietorship.

No statistics of home proprietorship in this country have ever been published, except for Boston in 1845; but a tendency towards tenancy is indicated by the figures for 1890. In all the States named there is a larger percentage of home tenancy in the towns and cities having a population of 8,000 people and over, than in the remainder of each State. Since the first census in 1790 there has been an increasing proportion of the population in such towns and cities from census to census; this population was 3.35 per cent. of the total population in 1790; 12.49 per cent. in 1850; 29.20 per cent. in 1890.

The percentage of this population is now regarded as one that will increase for a long time in the future, and, since home-owning is much less prevalent in towns and cities of 8,000 people and over than it is outside of these towns and cities, there is a strong force at work throughout the country against home-owning, and the increase of home-owning outside of cities of 8,000 people and over must be sufficient to balance this if home tenancy through the country at large is not to increase. The increase in the proportion of home-owning required for this balancing is not too great to be impossible.

If we take Massachusetts, the most densely-populated State in the Union, and allow for 1880 the proportions of home-hiring families in towns and cities of 8,000 people and over and in the State at large that are found in 1890, the percentage of home-hiring families outside of such towns and cities must have been almost exactly 60 in 1880; in 1890 the percentage was 56, so that the degree of home tenancy in the whole State need not have diminished in 1890 if we allow a decrease in home tenancy from 60 to 54 per cent. within the decade outside of the class of towns and cities described.

In Boston, where the only positive evidence of home-owning tendency can be found, 76.71 per cent. of the total number of home families hired their homes in 1845 and 81.57 per cent. in 1890. But, owing to railroad accommodations, the Boston of the present time properly includes the remainder of Suffolk County and many neighboring towns and cities whose population nearly equals that of Boston itself and whose proportion of home tenancy is less than is found in that city, so that if the figures of home proprietorship were obtainable for a region, say, within a radius of 10 or 12 miles from the State House, it is quite certain that they would show a proportion of home tenancy no greater than was discovered in Boston in 1845.

Nevertheless, the home tenancy in cities will be regarded as excessively large. Among the 101 towns and cities with a population of more than 8,000 in these States, including the District of Columbia, Clinton, Ia., with a population of 13,619, has the smallest proportion of tenancy, namely, 37.85 per cent., and Hoboken, N. J., containing 43,648 people, has the greatest—88.11 per cent. Boston, with a population of 448,477, has 81.57 per cent.; Baltimore, with 434,439 people, has 73.94 per cent.; Jersey City, whose population is 163,003, has 81.20 per cent.; and in Newark, with 181,830 people, 77.98 per cent. of the families hire their homes. City life everywhere seems to lead to relatively low proportions of home-owning families, although to no great extent in the South.

The increase of farm and home tenancy, if increase of home tenancy may

be admitted, is not due to any obstacles placed by law or custom in the way of the purchase of real estate. It is easy enough to buy real estate if one has the desire and the means. The real-estate market, even in the older communities, is active according to the demand. In Hampden County, Massachusetts, containing Springfield and Holyoke, for example, there were 3,312 transfers of real estate in 1889, or one to 8.93 families of the county's population in 1890. During the 10 years 1880–'89 there were 24,327 transfers of real estate, or one to 1.03 of the families of the population of 1885.

The popularly assumed effects of the building and loan association movement on home-owning are hardly apparent in the statistics published by the Census Office. In Philadelphia, where the building and loan associations have reached the limit of their business, 77.24 per cent. of the home families are tenants, and in Hamilton County, Ohio, containing Cincinnati, where a large business is done by these associations, 78.05 per cent. of the home families hire their homes, or a proportion less than will be found in Chicago.

In comparing the two classes of owning and hiring families with each other, it may be that the units are unlike. In counting an owned against a hired home, it may be that greater weight in the comparison is given to the owned cabin of the negro laborer than to the vastly more comfortable and pretentious hired dwelling of the merchant or lawyer. The families in a State in which the proportion of hiring families is great may be much more happily situated than the families in a State where the proportion is much less. Even if the values of the farms and homes occupied by the two classes of families were known, still there might be the qualification that, notwithstanding values, residence in hired homes in some regions is accompanied by greater welfare and happiness than are found in owned homes in other regions.

In other respects, also, these statistics somewhat misrepresent the people in regard to welfare and social condition. It does not follow that a tenant family, because of tenancy, is not well cared for and in the receipt of an income sufficient for comfort and even many enjoyments and luxuries. Nor does it follow that a tenant family is unable to own a home, especially under mortgage, because of poverty, although this may be the inference in the case of the farm hiring-families.

The ownership of a home hinders migration, and civilization has not yet proceeded far enough to do away with migration as a means of bettering one's condition. To the workingman home-owning may often be a positive disadvantage in his dealings with his employers, or in the event of better inducements offered in another town. Generally, real estate is not readily sold without sacrifice and if he owns his home he will not readily migrate. A workingman may find himself out of employment at any time and, if he owns his home under mortgage, he may be unable to pay the interest when due and so lose some of his savings through foreclosure. The want of permanent local interests, the uncertainties of employment, of new undertakings in trade, and of ventures in a thousand and one directions, forbid men to own their homes.

Yet, after all else has been said, poverty undoubtedly plays an important, perhaps a chief part, as a cause of tenancy; and it is doubtful whether our traditional dislike of tenancy will permit us to regard its increase among those who are financially able to own their homes, but are unwilling to do so on account of new conditions of life, as altogether desirable.

GEORGE K. HOLMES.

AN UNCUT DIAMOND.

WE WERE talking of the slight put upon education by the World's Fair Commission. My interlocutor was a handsome, keen, prosperous-looking man in middle life, with a huge diamond in his by no means irreproachable shirt bosom, and another almost as large on his little finger. He defended the Commission, and expressed the opinion that the advantages of education in general were greatly over-estimated.

"Look at *me*, sir," he said. "I am a self-made man. I never had but three months' 'schoolin' in my life, and just see where I stand to-day!"

Good taste aside, there certainly was ample foundation for his boastful words and his still more boastful manner. He had been an alderman in his native city for "five years runnin'," and he was now its mayor. He had begun his business life as an errand boy in "a glass works," and was now, as he informed me, the proud owner of a quarter of a million of dollars. Men who had graduated from the best schools, including the university, came to him for his advice and "inflooence."

"Pretty good that, for a man who never saw the inside of a college—eh?"

"It certainly does great credit to your native sagacity, industry, and push," I replied.

"Yes, sir, I suppose we must admit that. Education is a good thing, no doubt, a very good thing; but you see it ain't absolutely necessary to success in life. I done without it, and I have got along fairly well."

"Yes, Mr. Mayor, you have got along more than fairly well. Judged by the usual standards, you have succeeded far better than the great majority of men who have been through the schools."

What more I actually said does not matter. I might have said: But your boast that you have had only "three months' schoolin'" is not true. You have been to school all your life. The rays that emanate from the lamps of learning are not imprisoned within the four walls of the school-house. They shine through the windows and doors. Every man and every woman who graduates from the schools is a torch-bearer, and you have been more or less enlightened by the universal flood of light, although you may have borne no torch yourself.

You are no more "self-made" than the most erudite son of Harvard or Yale. If he is made at all it has been as truly through his own intelligence, energy, industry, and push, as your own making has been through the qualities of which you boast so offensively. Every educated man with whom you have talked, every public speaker you have heard, has been your school-master; every newspaper you have read, your text-book; every position you have occupied, your class-room. The scholar in the school, the student in the college, is no more the passive recipient of his instruction than you are the passive recipient of yours. Walking in the flood of light which has everywhere surrounded you, how could you help being enlightened if you are capable of enlightenment? Many are not thus capable, and these the schools will help no more than the lighted torch will help the blind man. You are no more independent of the school house, Mr. Mayor, than the man who has spent all the days of his youth there. Though you might never have crossed its threshold, yet it is the principal and original cause of the difference between you and the savage chief in the wilderness.

You say you "done without education and have got along fairly well." As I have shown, you have *not* done without it. The only things

it has lacked in your case are the system, symmetry, and thoroughness which actual attendance at the schools might have given it.

And now let us see what these might have done for you.

You pass for a man of thorough information and logical thought only among men of your own or of inferior grade, and it is only because these are in such a majority in your city that you hold so high a place in the general estimation. Among your intellectual superiors you are known for the shrewd, forceful, successful, but comparatively shallow man you really are.

You might not have been wealthier than you are, perhaps not so wealthy; but you would have got more from your wealth. The richly-bound books in your library would have been an intellectual thesaurus to you, instead of a mere household decoration. In all probability you would not have hung those travesties of art which you call paintings on your walls for your more cultivated visitors to laugh at. It is not likely that you would now be wearing those hideous diamonds (the beautiful may become hideous when out of place), and your still more incongruous vulgarisms of speech and behavior would not constantly excite the contemptuous wonder of those into whose society your "success in life" has lifted you. It is probable, too, that if your more refined taste had not toned down your aggressive vanity and egotism, it would at least have prevented their offensive exhibition on all occasions.

Even if I could convince you of the truth of all this, it might seem to you of little importance, compared with the great facts of your wealth and achievements. But these very facts are an injury to the community in which you live, for they lower the standard of civilization, which does not depend upon wealth alone nor upon the holding of office. Magnify your vanity, boastfulness, vulgar display, ignorance, and contempt for education sufficiently, *i. e.*, nullify what the common school has indirectly, if not directly, done for you, and you become brother to the Ashantee chief.

Do you think education might have lessened your energy and push? Unlike the blazing jewel in your soiled shirt bosom, the human diamond is not diminished but rather increased in weight by proper cutting.

EDWARD P. JACKSON.

STUDENTS AS SHOWMEN.

"PERMISSION has been given to the Glee Club, Banjo Club, and Guitar and Mandolin Club to make a trip through the West during the Christmas recess, similar to that made two winters ago by the two former organizations. . . . . Concerts will be given in New York, December 23; Chicago, December 26; St. Louis, December 27; Cincinnati, December 29; Washington, December 31, and Philadelphia, January 1."

This tour, the announcement of which is taken from a college periodical (*Harvard Monthly*), is an example of a comparatively new feature of student life in this country. In this instance a company of a score or more young men travelled some three thousand miles, and gave six musical performances within ten days. Taking all the colleges together, it is probably not far from the truth to say that several hundred students now spend the whole or a part of their winter recess in a similar manner. The object of these tours, in which sometimes concerts and sometimes dramatic or minstrel performances are given, is various. Very often, however, if I am not mistaken, the surplus receipts, if there are any, after the expenses are paid, are bestowed upon some college institution. It is in this respect alone, and in the fact

that the students are amateurs and not professionals, that they differ from any travelling theatrical or musical company or other purveyors to the public entertainment.

I have sought diligently for arguments in favor of these tours and can find at least four. They furnish an absolute change from the routine of college life, and a welcome relief from study. They enable the students to see different parts of the country without expense to themselves. The college of which they are members is advertised ; and some money may be obtained. If there are still other arguments in their favor, and I am quite ready to believe there are, I have not been able to discover them. My uncertainty arises from the fact that these advantages derived from these tours seem to me utterly insufficient to outweigh the numerous and obvious objections to them. And, accordingly, I am at a loss to know why, notwithstanding these objections, they are permitted by college faculties and by parents.

For, to take only the least of these objections, they are completely subversive of the objects for which the holiday is intended. These, of course, are that the student may have a respite from his studies and for a short time come under the humanizing influences of his family, so that he may return to his work with a fresh zest for it and with greater strength to resist the manifold temptations of college life.

But in what condition must the students, in the case referred to above and in all similar cases, have necessarily come back to their studies after their holiday trip. The college term closed on December 23. That night they gave a concert in New York. Term began again on January 2. The night before there was a performance in Philadelphia. During the intervening eight days they appeared in four cities at great distances apart, so that almost the whole of the time, including Sunday, not given to their concerts, must have been spent upon the road. It would require weeks at the very least for young men but barely passed boyhood to recover from the physical exhaustion and nervous strain incident on such a journey. Jaded and wearied in body they would necessarily resume their college duties in a far more unfit condition than if they had had no respite from them.

Of their mental condition I cannot speak so positively. There can be no question, however, that so far as diversity of occupation is concerned, this end is completely gained. Nothing more foreign to the true collegiate life can well be imagined than the life of a touring actor or musician. Nor can there be less doubt of the attractiveness to most young men of this wandering life, of the repeated appearances before the footlights, of the efforts to win applause and the intoxicating influence of the applause when won. Can any one believe that the young student who has experienced all this, though only for a brief period, will bring back to his books a "quiet mind" and a fresh impetus for study? Will he not, on the contrary, return to his work with a restless spirit and with his natural desire for continuous excitement greatly inflamed? Will not the restraints of college duties be more irksome than before and his books less welcome companions?

But this jaded bodily state, and mind all unattuned to its true work, may not, to my thinking, be the worst that can befall these young men, who spend their vacation in this manner. I do not now refer to the peculiar temptations which will surely come to them under such circumstances—temptations the harder to resist since they are voluntarily met. Nor do I have in mind their loss who, not once only, but twice or thrice it may be,

give up the pleasures of home at the most gracious season of the year on such an errand. But this travelling about the country as hired entertainers of the public imperils something more than the duties of a few weeks of a college term—may have a more enduring influence than temporarily exhausted strength and a mind out of harmony with its true self. The strength will come again; the mind can shake off these disturbing impressions. There is grave danger, however, that an impression may be made which will prove indelible—that something may be lost which can never be recovered. It is not impossible that the whole current of a young man's thoughts and ambitions may be permanently diverted into new and less worthy channels through this experience.

Something may be lost which it is hard to describe or define, but which seems to me to be essential to the true gentleman. Refinement, delicacy of feeling, dignity, shrinking from publicity, unwillingness to make one's self common; all these things, which are so gracious and so necessary, are gravely imperilled by the young collegians who go from city to city exhibiting themselves and their mediocre ability to play or sing or act—for money. I would not be understood to say that the public performance is necessarily in itself an ungentlemanly thing. It is the motive, the end sought, which stamps upon an action its character of gentlemanliness or vulgarity.

Those Oxford students who, a few years ago, under the stimulating influence of Ruskin's teaching, went out to build roads, were by so doing tenfold better gentlemen, notwithstanding they were doing "navvies'" work. The principle which inspired them ennobled their rude toil. But these wandering musicians and actors of whom we are writing have no such motive. No elevating principle spurs them on to endure such sacrifice of ease. The ignoblest of motives is theirs. In a word, they make themselves common or vulgar—for pay.

It is difficult for me to conceive what further advance can be made in the direction of taking the student out of his own proper sphere and putting him in one totally foreign to it. Thirty years ago many of our colleges arranged their winter terms and vacations in such a way as to permit the poorer students to teach school. Rough, unkempt, many of these men were, but they were full of zeal for knowledge, and gladly endured the privations and hardships of some backwoods district for a meagre sum—enough, however, to enable them to win their way to a degree. But in these days we have improved on that laborious and self-denying method of making money. Instead of the hard-working teacher strengthening brain and intellectual power by his toil, gaining invaluable lessons of self control and developing the capacity for imparting knowledge and for the government of others, and so fitting himself for the highest positions in life, we have the peripatetic amateur minstrel or actor winning his dollars on the stage and preparing himself, at the best, for a useless future in which "having a good time" will be the ruling motive.

Does this contrast represent in truth a changed condition of college feeling and sentiment, and are we to go still farther away from the old ideals, to lower still more the standard of what a student can do and remain a gentleman? Must we look forward to the time when ladies' orchestras and amateur ballet-troupes from the Harvard Annex or Wellesley College shall vie with the student minstrels as amusers of the public? Or is this but a passing and regrettable phase of these last decades of the nineteenth century, upon which another generation will look back with a mingled feel

ing of amusement and contempt. The remedy is a simple one. If parents will forbid their sons to join these musical and dramatic clubs except on the express condition that no public performances of this character shall be given for money, we shall hear no more of these highly objectionable tours.

JAMES M. HUBBARD.

CAMPAIGNING IN THE WEST.

NO ONE could take an active part upon the stump in such a campaign as that of 1892, and not come out of it with an increased respect for the good faith and excellent sense of the multitudes who attend our political meetings.

It is more evident now than it ever was before that the people insist upon the best kind of speaking. Political orators never make a greater mistake than when they count upon clap-trap as a means of influencing votes. Of course there are exceptions. The question of the politics of Mr. Frick in the last campaign is an instance. The feelings aroused among some of our Irish fellow-citizens by criticisms on Patrick Egan is another instance. But in the long run it is seldom that the strongest weapons are found in appeals of this description.

The professional story-teller is at a discount. An apt illustration is always in place and it ought to be, but a speaker who goes through the country to day telling of the Republican pup which has its eyes open and the Democratic pup which has its eyes closed will not win votes, even if he gets the whoops and plaudits of the boys and torch-bearers in his audience. Most disastrous of all is the abusive speaker, the man who insists that all Republicans are boodlers or that all Democrats are imps of hell. Personalities, unless they be the mere recital of clearly-proved facts in the political records of the men assailed, are most unfortunate. Vituperative epithets are worse than useless. The facts must speak for themselves. There has been a great deal of satire written and believed regarding the absurd arguments which have sometimes succeeded in influencing the verdict of a jury in a trial at law or in influencing the judgment of the multitude in the trial of political issues. Undoubtedly personal, local and political prejudices cannot be ignored, but with the spread of general intelligence these factors become constantly of less account. Political speakers often think that they have to descend to the comprehension of their hearers, when, in point of fact, the good sense of the men who listen is quite as great as that of the man who addresses them.

Of course it is always wise to speak plainly. The thoughts which are clothed in simple phrase appeal best not only to the ignorant but to men of culture. The colloquial style conforms best, not merely to the demands of the unlearned, but to the highest standards. But the time is past when mere declamation, noise and fustian are of any value. It is the things you have to say, not the language in which these things are clothed, which is the important matter.

A man who believes that the shouts of his auditors indicate the success of his argument is greatly deceived. I once heard Senator Sherman in a speech at the Grand Opera House in my own town. His arguments were clear and convincing, but not striking or sensational. Those who heard him listened with attention, but were not demonstrative. He was followed by a so-called "Irish orator," who told a great number of common-place stories, which were uproariously applauded. The latter undoubtedly left the

town with the idea that he had made a much greater hit than Mr. Sherman. He was never more mistaken. Close attention is always a better standard of the value of the thing said than any amount of noise.

I have been surprised at the ease with which plain, uneducated people appreciate even abstruse economic problems where they are stated with reasonable clearness. And there is not much difference in the classes that constitute the audiences nor the neighborhood from which they come. An assembly of plain-looking Indiana farmers and mechanics understands these things about as well as the choicest assemblies from the environs of Boston or New York. Indeed, in the matter of political education, I am of opinion that the citizens of Indiana are rather in advance of those of the Atlantic seaboard. The Eastern man has more of that which is technically labelled culture. He will notice more critically a fault in grammar or a sentence badly turned. The Western man goes beneath the form and considers little but the thought which it expresses. He has broader and, I think, juster views of life and of political perspective.

As one who has spent half his life in each section, I am satisfied that the East knows much less of the West than we do of our Eastern brethren. Chicago has never yet been thoroughly understood by New York, which thought, for instance, that our Columbian Exposition, when Chicago won the prize, would be nothing but a country fair. The Chicago man has a better knowledge of New York. He knows less of books, but he has seen more of life and of the world. There is the same difference between Europe and America. We know more of the Old World than it knows of us.

Another characteristic of a political campaign in the West is its enthusiasm and heartiness. The New Englander goes to bed at a certain fixed hour. No matter how important the question or how eloquent the speech, he cannot be counted upon to remain in the hall much after bedtime. During the last campaign in New England there were often two or three speakers at each meeting, sometimes four or five, and these men had to divide as evenly as possible the scant two hours allotted. In Indiana a single speaker generally consumes the entire time, and most of his hearers will listen in quiet attention until midnight, if necessary. Indeed, a public speaker who stints them with an hour's speech will often be regarded in the light of the tradesman who gives short measure. They are entitled to an hour and a half or two hours of it, and the speaker has no right to defraud the men who come to hear him.

In the East, the audience is perhaps more enthusiastic in the matter of applause than in the West. In Indiana, men will sit during an entire afternoon or evening with little demonstration, but when the speaker closes they throng around him to shake hands and congratulate him, and tell him how much good he has done. The stump speaker, for the time being, is like a governor, a congressman or a president. His hearers come up in long lines and press his knuckles almost out of joint. The men of his own party in the town where he goes take every care that his meeting shall be a success. There is great heartiness in the hospitality of these Western audiences.

A few weeks ago I spoke in a small country town in the southern part of Indiana. A great multitude from the surrounding country attended. There were two saloons in the place and upon that day each of them might have counted upon doing the business of a whole average month. Yet the meeting was on behalf of their party. It must not be disgraced by an orgy, so each

of these saloon keepers locked his doors, barricaded them from the inside and remained within until the meeting was over to prevent intoxication at the "rally."

Out-of-door meetings are much more common in the West than along the Atlantic seaboard. The last campaign was a very quiet one and these meetings were more infrequent everywhere than usual. But generally they have been very common in States where the facilities for indoor meetings are entirely inadequate. There are few halls large enough to contain the thousands who assemble at these great political demonstrations, and the only way to accommodate the multitude is to erect a small platform somewhere in the woods and to procure a supply of planks from a neighboring lumber yard, which are placed upon beams or blocks of wood, and will thus seat an unlimited number of auditors. Those who come in carriages form a circle on the outside, while, still beyond, side shows attract all those who do not care to hear the speaking. There is generally a glee club to begin the entertainment, and sometimes a song or two afterwards closes the meeting.

It is, of course, much harder to talk in the open air than in a hall, and with a stiff breeze blowing, the lung power of the speaker is tested to the utmost. The avenues of escape and the attractions from the outside are much greater, and the audience will continually change, many leaving, others taking their places. Even a moderate-sized hall will often contain as many auditors as those who remain within hearing from the beginning to the end of a great "rally," so that these out-door meetings are less valuable for educational purposes than much smaller gatherings within doors. They are chiefly important for the "demonstration," the size and impressiveness of the parade, the show wagons filled with gaily dressed maidens, goddesses of liberty, etc., and uniformed clubs. We may congratulate ourselves that these methods seem to be going out of use.

The wear and tear of a campaign are very great. To speak each day to a multitude in the open air for two hours, then to travel perhaps twenty miles across the country and talk for two hours more at night in an adjacent county town strains the strength and vitality of any man. Yet those who can husband their resources, and can so arrange their appointments as to secure a good night's sleep (a thing not always possible), will sometimes come out of a campaign in better condition than when they enter it.

After two or three speeches have been carefully prepared at the outset of a campaign they may be varied and repeated indefinitely, and the intellectual exhaustion is not great. The hardest strain is in the few cases where the addresses are reported in full. Then the speaker must prepare a new one each day, and after a week or two of such a drain the brain of the most fertile speaker will be exhausted and he must seek a respite.

Where two or more men speak at a single meeting, they are expected to divide the time as equitably as possible. But this is not always done. The first speaker sometimes becomes so deeply engrossed in his subject that he takes no note of the lapse of his allotted hour, and he often leaves to his companion little more than the meagre remnants of the time and sometimes of the audience. There are few men so patriotic that they will stand the frequent repetition of this treatment with anything more than superficial equanimity.

WILLIAM DUDLEY FOULKE.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXXV.

FEBRUARY, 1893.

HOW TO REVISE THE TARIFF.

BY THE HON. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER, CHAIRMAN OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

No GENERAL tariff measure has been passed in this country when the Democratic party was in power in both branches of Congress, and when there was a Democratic President, since July 30, 1846, when the act known as the Walker tariff became the law of the land, more than forty-six years ago. At that time England was engaged in the work of repealing the restrictive and protective tariff laws of that country. The reduction of tariff duties was the prominent issue in politics in both countries. The measures finally adopted in England were much more radical than were the provisions of the Walker tariff, but they have remained substantially as adopted at that time until the present day; and there can be no doubt that the United States would have long since reached and adopted a tariff for revenue only, had it not been for the Civil War, which began in 1861.

The Walker tariff continued in force without change until March 3, 1857, when Congress passed an act further reducing the duties on imports.

The highest average ad valorem rate of duties on dutiable articles imported under the tariff of 1842 was in 1844, when the rate reached 36.88 per centum. In 1848, at the end of the second year of the Walker tariff, such rates were reduced to 26.28 per centum; and in 1857 the rates had been brought down to an

Copyright, 1893, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

average of 22.45. After the passage of the act of March 3, 1857, the rates for the year 1858 were 22.43 per centum; and in 1861 the average ad valorem rates of dutiable articles was only 18.84 per centum.

It will be seen from this that the effect of the Walker tariff, and the amendment to it in 1857, was to produce a lower average rate of duty from year to year, which showed that the articles bearing the lower rates of duty were imported more largely than those bearing higher rates of duty.

The Walker tariff was, as stated heretofore, passed when the Democratic party was in power in all the branches of the Government. James K. Polk had been elected President, and Robert J. Walker, of Mississippi, had been appointed Secretary of the Treasury. While the Walker tariff was regarded as a Democratic measure at the time of its passage, the House of Representatives which passed the act of March 3, 1857, was composed of a majority of those opposed to the Democratic party, that House having elected Nathaniel P. Banks, of Massachusetts, Speaker. Louis D. Campbell, of Ohio, an old line Whig, was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; and other members of that committee, whose names are well known in the country, were William A. Howard, of Michigan; Henry Winter Davis, of Maryland; Russell Sage, of New York; Howell Cobb, of Georgia; and George W. Jones, of Tennessee.

The representatives from the State of Massachusetts in 1846 voted solidly against the Walker tariff; but in 1857 the entire delegation from that State voted for the bill to further reduce the duties contained in the Walker tariff. This fact is significant when it is remembered that the Walker tariff had reduced duties to an average of 22.45 per centum on manufactured articles in opposition to the votes of the members representing the States wherein industries were most clamorous for tariff legislation. After twelve years' practical experience under the Walker tariff, which was regarded as a tariff for revenue only, Congress, with the consent of the representatives of the protected interests, further reduced such duties to an average of less than 19 per centum.

The population of the United States in 1845 was about twenty millions; the population in 1860 was thirty-one millions, an increase of over 50 per centum. The imports for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1846, were valued at $121,000,000; in 1860 they were valued at $362,000,000, an increase of 199 per centum. The exports from the United States in 1846 were $113,000,000; while in 1860 they were $400,000,000, an increase of 254 per centum. The total imports and exports in 1846 were $235,000,000; and in 1860 they were $762,000,000, being an increase of 225 per centum. There were less than 5,000 miles of railroad in the country in 1846; while there were 30,626 miles in 1860, an increase of 512 per centum. There were 123,000 manufacturing establishments in the United States in 1850; and 140,433 in 1860, an increase of 17,433 in ten years. There was undoubtedly a large increase of such establishments between 1846 and 1850; but the census was not taken between 1840 and 1850. The capital employed in manufactures in 1850 was $533,000,000; while in 1860 it had increased to $1,000,000,000, an increase of 87 per centum. The value of the product of manufacturing establishments in 1850 was $1,000,000,000; while in 1860 it was $1,855,000,000.

These statistics will serve to establish the fact that the country was fairly prosperous during the fifteen years of low tariff, between 1846 and 1861.

President Harrison, in his recent message to Congress, referred to the remarkable growth of the country between 1860 and 1890, and claimed that the protective system which prevailed during that time was "a mighty instrument for the development of our national wealth." Among other evidences of the development of our national wealth which he attributed to protection, he instanced the increased mileage of our railroads during these thirty years, which was 448 per centum. But during the fifteen years of low tariff between 1846 and 1861 the increase of such mileage was 512 per centum. Those who favor a low tariff do not claim that all the prosperity of the country between 1846 and 1861 was due to our revenue laws. All they claim is that low tariffs are not incompatible with a high state of national and individual prosperity, or with the greatest development possible of national resources.

In December, 1845, Robert J. Walker, the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitted his report on the state of the finances to Congress. After the formal parts of his report had been submitted, he proceeded to consider the subject of the tariff. The following extract from his report is of great interest at this time,

when the next Congress, soon to assemble, must pass upon the same subject. Mr. Walker said :

"In suggesting improvements in the revenue laws, the following principles have been adopted :

"1st. That no more money should be collected than is necessary for the wants of the government, economically administered.

"2d. That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue.

"3d. That, below such rate, discrimination may be made, descending in the scale of duties; or, for imperative reasons, the article may be placed in the list of those free from all duty.

"4th. That the maximum revenue duty should be imposed on luxuries.

"5th. That all minimums, and all specific duties, should be abolished, and ad valorem duties substituted in their place—care being taken to guard against fraudulent invoices and under-valuation, and to assess the duty upon the actual market value.

"6th. That the duty should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section.

Upon the propositions thus stated, the tariff act of 1846 was framed. The substance of these propositions has been iterated and reiterated in Democratic platforms and conventions from that time to the present. There have, it is true, been material variations and modifications of these propositions, and Democrats prominent in the party have advanced views not in harmony with the propositions of Mr. Walker. They are, however, substantially in accord with the declaration of principles adopted by the Democratic convention at Chicago in June, 1892, and upon which platform the Democratic party has again come into power in the government. Therefore, in revising the present tariff, wise statesmanship and strict adherence to party pledges both alike require that the new tariff, which is to be framed in the near future, should be bottomed, as far as possible, upon the principles so clearly stated by Mr. Walker in 1846.

These propositions required :

1st. That no more money should be collected than is necessary for the wants of the government, and that the government should be economically administered.

2d. That no duty should be imposed above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue. This contemplates a tariff for revenue only, and not framed with a view to protecting any class of industries.

3d. That, below the revenue standard, Congress may discrimi-

nate as to the rate, and may admit certain articles free of all duty.

4th. That the highest duties should be imposed on luxuries. This proposition ought to receive universal approval. In party platforms, the claim is generally made that duties should be so imposed, but in practice, especially as illustrated in the McKinley act, the rule is generally the reverse, the highest duties being placed upon the necessaries of life, and the lowest upon luxuries.

5th. That minimums should be abolished. Such rates have already been dispensed with.

The sixth proposition is one which ought to receive universal approval, namely, that the duties should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible in all parts of the country.

But the most important of all the propositions laid down by Mr. Walker is that "all specific duties should be abolished and ad valorem duties substituted in their place." This rule was adhered to in the Walker tariff, which does not contain one item which imposed a specific duty, or a duty levied upon the pound or quantity, but the duty was always imposed upon the article according to its value. This is the distinctive feature of the Walker tariff, as compared with all other tariff laws passed in this country.

In view of the early revision of the tariff laws of this country, special consideration should be given to the fifth proposition laid down by Mr. Walker, namely, that all specific duties should be abolished and ad valorem duties substituted in their place.

Mr. Walker, in his report to Congress in 1845, demonstrated clearly that the operation of specific duties discriminates against the poor and in favor of the rich. He said that, if direct taxes were made specific, they would be intolerable. "Thus," said he, "if an annual tax of thirty dollars was assessed on all houses, without respect to their actual value, making the owner of the humble tenement or cabin pay a tax of thirty dollars, and the owner of a costly mansion a tax of but thirty dollars on their respective houses, it would differ only in degree, but not in principle, from the same unvarying specific duty on cheap as on fine articles." He held that, if any discrimination should be made, it should be the reverse of the specific duty. He further said: "The tax upon the actual value is the most equal, and can only be accomplished by ad valorem duties."

The truth of these statements is clearly demonstrated by

reference to some of the compound ad valorem and specific duties contained in the McKinley act.

Under the provisions of paragraph 392 of the McKinley act, on shawls made wholly or in part of wool, worsted, etc., valued at more than thirty and not more than forty cents per pound, the duty shall be 38½ cents a pound and 40 per centum ad valorem. This rate does not suggest anything unusual as compared with other rates in that act; but when, by the actual importations of such shawls for the year 1892, the equivalent ad valorem rate was ascertained, it was found that they were taxed 138.63 per centum upon their value.

Turning to paragraph 335, we find that champagne and all other sparkling wines, in bottles containing more than one pint and not more than one quart, are taxed at $8 per dozen. This seems high enough as a specific rate, when the value is not taken into consideration; but, when applied to the actual importations of champagne for the year ending June 30, 1892, it appears that the equivalent ad valorem rate was only 57.29 per centum. Thus, by the device of specific duties, as embraced in the McKinley act, champagne, the greatest of luxuries, pays less than half the rate, according to its value, which is imposed upon the cheap woollen shawls which the poor women of the country must wear to protect them from the chilling blasts of winter.

Woollen and worsted cloths valued at not more than thirty cents per pound, these being the cheapest made, are taxed thirty-three cents per pound, and 40 per centum ad valorem, by the McKinley act. The equivalent ad valorem rate applied to the actual importations of this class of goods for the last year was 162.04 per centum; and the average ad valorem rate of duty upon all manufactures of wool for that year was 95.81 per centum; while the average ad valorem rate of duty upon importations of wines of all kinds for the same year was 54.73 per centum. No such rates as these could ever have been passed in a tariff bill which provided upon its face for ad valorem rates. They are only possible by a combination of ad valorem and specific duties, or by specific duties alone. The actual amount of the tax, as compared with the value of the article upon which it is placed, is concealed. The McKinley act is a combination of such cunningly devised rates. To construct a bill of that kind, requires extraordinary skill and utter disregard of all principles of justice and even of common

honesty. The McKinley act contains 32,000 words; the Walker act contained less than 5,000 words. The injustice and inequalities of the McKinley act are apparent at a glance, when the rates are applied to actual importations. Take, for instance, the metal schedule. The rates in this schedule, when reduced to an ad valorem basis, vary from 2.33 to 97 per centum ad valorem; the average in the whole schedule amounting to 55.40 per centum ad valorem.

I will not say that the higher rates were placed upon articles manufactured by individuals who contributed most liberally to Republican campaign funds; but I will say that it would be the easiest thing in the world to so place such rates, and it would be ungrateful on the part of those who received special benefits by the higher protection upon the articles which they manufacture, if they should withhold liberal contributions to the political party that gave them such substantial advantages over their rivals in business.

The immorality of protective tariffs is strongly illustrated by the fact that the persons engaged in certain lines of business are induced, when approaching the ballot box, to vote for the candidates of the party which proposes to secure to them the highest prices for the goods which they manufacture and have to sell. Thus, patriotism and the general welfare are lost sight of in selfishness and the desire for individual gain. How much better is the manufacturer who votes millions into his pocket than the poor unfortunate individual who sells his vote for five dollars, or a less amount, when prompted by the cravings of hunger, or the desire to furnish a moiety of bread for his starving children.

It would prolong this article far beyond the limits which have been prescribed for it, if I should undertake to point out in detail the provisions of a bill for the general revision of the tariff. Such details can only be agreed upon by those upon whom the Constitution has imposed the duty of originating and passing bills for raising revenue. Suffice it to say, however, that the principles which governed in the construction of the Walker tariff of 1846 furnish the basis upon which the tariff may now be revised. A measure based upon such principles has already stood the test of time. The principles upon which it is founded are those which have received the sanction of the Democratic party in the past; and, if adhered to in the future, will make the pathway to tariff revision easy and the remedy for existing evils complete.

WILLIAM M. SPRINGER.

RECOLLECTIONS OF THE PANAMA CANAL CONGRESS.

BY REAR-ADMIRAL DANIEL AMMEN, U. S. N.

ON THE 15th of May next fourteen years will have passed since the convening of the Paris Canal Congress which was invoked, as I purpose showing, to indorse the Panama Canal Company. In order to comprehend the inception of this Congress, which was assembled on M. de Lesseps's invitation, some facts in advance will be brought to view.

The Geographical Society of Paris had an attachment, or "annex," as appears in the articles of agreement, which I quote from THE REVIEW of February, 1880, page 144:

"Articles of Agreement of the International Society for cutting an interoceanic canal through the Isthmus of Darien, August 19, 1878.

"ARTICLE I. A mutual society is hereby formed by the subscribers, with the following objects: 1. To cause to be made by chosen engineers the general outline and estimates for an interoceanic canal, without locks or tunnels, across the Isthmus of Darien, following first and foremost the track indicated by M. Gogorza.

"ARTICLE VIII. Of the six remaining beneficiary shares two are to be at the disposal of General Turr, and of the four others, two shall be allotted to M. Wyse, who will conduct the expedition, and two others to be reserved for a purpose known to the persons interested."

The subscribers to the International Civil Society of the Interoceanic Canal met on June 9, 1879, and the President spoke as follows: "Whoever then builds the canal, our Society will have given the initiative to the work. We hoped that it would push the execution of the work under the direction of the illustrious founder of the Suez Canal, but M. de Lesseps, who for four years has assisted us with his advice, has now decided to prosecute in person the realization of this immense enterprise, and desires that our Society should concede to him its interest, only preserving in the company he is about to form the interest resulting from our share of the capital."

A member having stated his views in relation to the share of the conceding society, M. de Lesseps said: "Your declarations

are loyal, and I take pleasure in telling you so; but I will be obliged to ask you to make me a written proposition." I said to General Turr: "If your Society is in a position to prosecute the work, I do not seek to interfere, and I retire; but in the contrary case, as I shall have all the responsibility, I do not desire partners in what concerns the subscriptions, nor engagements with any one."

"Two days later, in answer to our proposition, M. de Lesseps sent us an opinion drawn up by his counsel, of which the following is an abstract: 'By the terms of this document, M. de Lesseps not only enters into this negotiation with his name and moral influence, but with a positive determined right of intervention. The act of incorporation of the conceding society declares that the presidency shall be offered to him; therefore he might have identified himself with our Civil Society, in which he, as president, would have the casting vote in case of division. His official influence has been, nevertheless, important. Messrs. Wyse and Reclus undertook the exploration by his advice, and the confidence of capitalists was stimulated by the certainty that he would put himself at the head of the enterprise when the moment of execution should arrive. M. de Lesseps summoned the Congress, and brought together the former engineers of Suez, by whom the technical and statistical problems were solved. The estimate of probable revenues, on which will be based the appeal to capital, is the work of the Congress, presided over by M. de Lesseps, and the programme for the execution of the work will result from the labors of the Congress as much as, if not more than, from the investigations of the Civil Society. Finally, the vote of the Congress has conferred on M. de Lesseps a new right, inasmuch as a part of the votes were influenced by the confidence with which he inspired the electors. Supposing that the Society should sell its right, could it do so without remunerating M. de Lesseps and his colleagues? If M. de Lesseps claims nothing, his refusal to claim cannot benefit the Civil Society, and its shareholders should reckon with M. de Lesseps.'"

The proceedings of this association as given above, before and after the convocation of the Paris Canal Congress, can hardly leave a doubt of the *raison d'être*, or what may be called the *specific purpose of that Congress.*

Early in October 1876 M. Drouillet, Civil Engineer and

Secretary of the French section of the "International Society for the Study of the Exploration of the American Isthmus, with the View of the Construction of an Interoceanic Canal," introduced himself to me in Washington. I was then Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, in the Navy Department. He presented a part of the proceedings of the Commission, and a pamphlet by himself, in which he states, as translated by me:

"The problem of interoceanic navigation is, at present, incapable of solution on account of the insufficiency of geographical data, and of the flagrant contradictions which exist in these data, an insufficiency and contradictions which do not permit the engineer to study profoundly a definite project."

On the strength of these assertions, and with the seeming approval of the Geographical Society of Paris, an appeal is made "to the learned societies of the world, and to all the powers interested to lend their aid to a general and serious exploration of the Isthmus."

In view of the series of elaborate explorations and reconnoisances made by the United States Government, reported upon by the commission appointed by the President, and accepted as satisfactory, it seemed to me a duty to present, through the Geographical Society of New York, what had been accomplished and officially pronounced upon. This was done by letter on October 21. I then had occasion to refer to the fifteen projects or lines presented by M. Drouillet, among which he did not describe the instrumental location of the Nicaragua Canal route with sufficient exactness to assign it to any one of his fifteen projects, although on the preceding 7th of February the Commission appointed by the President had made its final report, which had a world-wide publicity, and from which I quote a paragraph: "That the Nicaragua Canal route possesses both for the construction and maintenance of a canal, greater advantages, and offers fewer difficulties from engineering, commercial and economic points of view, than any one of the other routes shown to be practicable by surveys sufficiently in detail to enable a judgment to be formed of their relative merits, as will be briefly presented in the appended memorandum."

In citing his authorities M. Drouillet makes mention of this report, and, notwithstanding, gave the height of Lake Nicaragua thirteen and one-half feet greater than its mean height above the

sea, given by our levels. From this I inferred that in the matter of the Isthmian surveys, he had not been able to separate "the wheat from the chaff," and, in consequence, entertained the doubts expressed in his pamphlet.

An expedition was sent in 1877 by the French association above named to the region of the Gulf of San Miguel, on the Pacific coast, to make explorations in the direction of Cape Tiburon, on the Atlantic coast, and was supplemented by another one the year following. On both occasions Lieut. Wyse, who had charge of the operations, visited Bogota, to obtain a concession.

Neither of these surveying parties just referred to ever reached the Atlantic coast, but "plans" were drawn for a sea-level canal, involving a tunnel of indefinite length. These plans, however, were not presented for the consideration of the Paris Canal Congress, but, instead, a "plan," drawn by Lieuts. Wyse and Reclus, for a sea-level canal, *actually predicated on a dozen cross-sections of levels on the Panama Railroad,* and, of course, the profile of the railroad, which was obtainable from the railroad company. This is an indisputable fact, the gravity of which the public may now see. It is strange, almost beyond conception, that M. de Lesseps should have given these "plans" his unqualified admiration in the Paris Congress, when the consequences were momentous.

The concession of the Panama Railroad estopped any concession by the Colombian Government for a transit west of the Bay of San Miguel on the Pacific, and Cape Tiburon on the Atlantic coast. The fact was established beyond peradventure, through our government surveys prior to those made by the French, that any practicable route in that region, whether with or without lockage, did not exist. It was very soon recognized by Lieut. Wyse that the vicinity of the Panama Railroad only afforded possibilities for a sea-level canal, the demand or requirement embodied in the articles of the Association given, in part, in this paper.

An instrumental examination was made of the Panama route in 1872, at the request of the American Commission for the examination of the Isthmian projects, in order to ascertain the relative practicability of the Panama and the Nicaragua routes. The reports accompanying the survey were published soon after it was completed, but the maps, plans, and profiles remained unpublished, and the sheets were under my charge, as Chief of Bureau

of Navigation. Returning homeward, after his second expedition, Lieut. Wyse paid me a visit in Washington, and at his request these sheets were shown him. I subsequently learned that he endeavored to obtain tracings of them through my subordinates. He did not mention to me the fact that he wished them, and from his conversation I inferred that he was satisfied with his surveys from the Bay of San Miguel to the Atlantic coast. He paid another visit to Washington in February 1879, when at his request I introduced him to President Hayes. His object was to express the wish of M. de Lesseps that our Government should be represented at the Paris Canal Congress which was to convene the following May. Some time after, and when the President had determined to send representatives, I saw Senator Anthony, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Printing, and suggested having the maps, plans, and profiles of the Panama and Atrato-Napipi surveys published, and they were presented in due form to the Paris Canal Congress, with all of our other Government surveys, comprising the whole Isthmian region.

Early in April the President informed me that he desired me to go to the Congress. I suggested that I was not a civil engineer, that I had been one of a commission that had expressed an opinion in relation to all of the trans-Isthmian routes; that my private affairs, although not large, would suffer through my absence, and to tell the whole truth, I did not wish to go. He replied that he regarded my going as important to our public interests. I then said that if that was his opinion I certainly would go, but that I would ask leave to write what I proposed saying to the Congress, when I formally presented our Government surveys, and expressed the hope that both he and the Secretary of State would give this paper a careful reading, so that I would have the assurance that I would utter nothing not in accord with their ideas. This was agreed to, and carried into effect.

From certain indications I had a suspicion, which I regretted to find afterwards was entirely warranted, that the Congress was called *not to discuss, but to assure and confirm what had been prearranged.*

On May 17, the third day after the convening of the Congress, the maps and plans had arrived, and I made a formal presentation of them. In my paper I stated that a Government

Commission had been appointed by President Grant on the 13th of March, 1872, whose duties were "to examine and consider all surveys, plans, proposals, or suggestions of routes of communication by canal or water, communications between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, across, over, or near the Isthmus, connecting North and South America, which have already been submitted, or which may hereafter be submitted, to the President of the United States, during the pendency of this appointment, or which may be referred to them by the President, and to report in writing their conclusion and the result of such examination to the President, with their opinion as to the possible cost and practicability of each route or plan, and such other matter in connection therewith as they may think proper and pertinent."

A final report was made by this Commission on the 7th of February, 1876. On the same day Mr. Menocal presented technically the Nicaragua Canal route, and explained his methods of overcoming difficulties in the execution of the work, in the improvement of Greytown harbor, and in making the dams on the San Juan River. The leading engineers of Paris were much gratified at his presentations of the important details.

Lieut. Wyse then placed on the stand for explanation his suggestion for a canal in the vicinity of the line of the Panama Railroad. I was not surprised at this change of base, from the Tuyra-Tupisa route, having read his last report, which had been given me two days before.

On the 19th, Sir John Hawkshaw, one of the ablest hydraulic engineers in Great Britain, arrived. The afternoon was taken up by alternate explanations of Lieuts. Wyse and Reclus, of their development of a canal along the general line of the Panama Railroad, on the ocean level, with and without a tunnel, and at the same time keeping up a running fire of objections to the Nicaragua Canal route. From the fact that Lieut. Wyse had abandoned the Tuyra-Tupisa route, and taken up the line of the Panama Railroad the cause of his anxiety when in Washington to obtain our surveys of the Panama route became apparent.

On the 20th Mr. Menocal explained the surveys and plans of the Panama route made by our Government, much to the satisfaction of Sir John Hawkshaw; no doubt less so to M. de Lesseps. He exposed the hopelessness of an attempt to make a sea-level canal, pointing out that there would be a cataract of the

Chagres River at Matachin of forty-two feet, which in periods of floods would be seventy-eight feet high, of a body of water thirty-six feet deep, with a width of fifteen hundred feet. The surprise and sorrow of those who had made "plans" for a sea-level canal can hardly be conceived. The fact stared them in the face that such plans were impracticable. There was, however, after a day or so, a presentation of "plans and estimates of cost of execution," quite independent of a sufficient knowledge of the topography upon which they could be properly based.

The next day Sir John gave his views on the construction of the Panama Canal as follows: "With regard to the question whether the canal should be constructed with or without locks, the following points occur to me: If the canal is to be without locks its normal surface level would be that of the sea, and its bottom level, say, eight metres lower. This being the case, the canal would receive and must provide for the whole drainage of the district traversed. Therefore it would be necessary to ascertain the volume of water that would drain into the canal before it would be possible even to determine the sectional area of the canal. If the canal have a still less surface fall than the river, as it would have, it must have a larger sectional area to discharge the same volume of water. The average section of the river in a flood at Mamei was ascertained by Mr. Reclus to be 1,310 square metres. This would require the canal, if it were eight metres deep, to be 160 metres wide.

"The waters of the Chagres would have a tendency to flow towards the Pacific, that is, through the tunnel, as the distance is less and the fall greater than to the Atlantic. It seems to me that the dimensions of the tunnel, if it has to serve for both the river and the canal, would be too small. Mr. Menocal's estimate of the volume of the Chagres in time of flood would much more than fill the tunnel; and in any case the whole section of the tunnel is only half that of the river in time of flood as given by Mr. Reclus. During the construction of a canal at the sea level, difficulties would arise in providing for drainage, which would affect both time of execution and cost to an extent that could hardly be ascertained in advance. From such considerations as the foregoing, it should be concluded that the canal should be constructed so as to retain the rivers for natural drainage; then recourse will have to be had to locks. In that event there

can be no difficulty, in my opinion, in carrying on the traffic with locks properly constructed, provided there is an ample water supply, which would be a *sine qua non.*"

In a private conversation with me, Sir John said that were a sea-level canal actually made it would be quite impossible to maintain it. It would at once be filled up by trees, bowlders, and silt brought down by the Chagres and other large streams in time of floods, and that having been in Central America "he knew how those showers behave."

On the 28th I was informed that the ablest engineers were very generally in favor of the Nicaragua route, and that nearly, if not all, of the other delegates were in favor of the Panama route. It was apparent from the first that there were two parties of "speculators" in the field, the one represented by M. Blanchet, who had an unconfirmed grant from the Nicaraguan Government, and Lieut. Wyse, who had a grant from the Colombian Government, embracing, with a reservation, the right to construct a ship canal over any part of her territory, the reservation applying to the already conceded monopoly of the Panama Railroad Company over the Isthmus proper. Lieut. Wyse had the powerful support of M. de Lesseps, and could have any desired majority on a vote as to the respective merits of the Nicaragua and Panama canal routes. The advocates of the Nicaragua route were disposed to regard Mr. Menocal and myself as their partisans, which we persistently declined to be, recognizing the fact that the mere preference of opinion in relation to the superiority of the Nicaragua route did not make it a duty to become advocates, except by inference, and through the presentation of facts. The absence of exact information, and perhaps the prejudices of the engineers in the beginning of the discussion, made them at least the tacit supporters of M. de Lesseps as to a sea-level canal. It was apparent, however, after the routes were discussed, that the ablest of them favored the Nicaragua route, and until the vote was taken this tendency gave M. de Lesseps a great deal of concern; he held a caucus late at night and told his adherents that all they had to do was to vote for a sea-level canal; *that it was his affair to make it.* I was told of this immediately after the adjournment, and it seemed to me so droll that an able diplomat should plan and insist upon his ruin, and that of his adherents, that I laughed outright. Had I, however, then supposed that it

would lead to the ruin of half a million persons I would not have considered it a laughing matter.

It was said that Mr. Menocal and myself had suffered a defeat in the decision of the Congress, which, although unhappily ruinous to those interested, was quite in accord with our preference. Had M. de Lesseps favored the Nicaragua route, the unconfirmed concession of Blanchet, which was as liberal as could have been desired, would doubtless have been confirmed, and a French canal across Nicaragua would probably within five years have been made more remunerative than the Suez Canal, which would have gladdened the hearts of the stockholders. Of course, every well-informed American knows that it is a matter of vast importance that it should be an American and not a European canal, which would control our coasting trade, and cut our military lines.

On the 29th a vote was taken on a resolution which had been drawn to conform to the wishes of M. de Lesseps, which were expressed as follows : " Le Congrès estime que le percement d'un canal inter-océanique à niveau constant, si désirable dans l'intérêt du commerce et de la navigation, est possible ; et que ce canal maritime, pour répondre aux facilités indispensables d'accès et d'utilisation que doit offrir avant tout un passage de ce genre, devra être dirigé du golfe de Limon à baie de Panama."

The official vote as given was: abstentions, 12 ; against the resolution, 8 ; in favor of it, 78. The most significant figure is omitted in the proceedings ; 38 were absent, and among them the ablest of the Society of Civil Engineers at Paris, and others of note. I abstained from voting on the ground that " only able engineers can form an opinion, after a careful study, of what is actually possible, and what is relatively economical in the construction of a ship canal." In relation to the vote on the resolution, a pamphlet published in Paris soon after, entitled " Panama, 400,000,000 francs a l'eau," states :

" Let it be remarked that one-half of the Congress were French ; that they had been chosen by the organizers of that assembly ; thirty-four members belonged to the Geographical or Commercial Geographical Society of Paris. What was their competency to decide between a canal with locks or on a sea-level ? Fourteen other members were engineers or assistants of some sort on the Suez Canal. What was their impartiality between M. de Lesseps and others ? And, among others, if one takes count of personal

friendships and the prestige exercised by a great name, how many more will remain ?"

Notwithstanding the large vote accorded M. de Lesseps, he got no substantial support in furtherance of the construction of his sea-level canal. On the 20th of June, the Society of Civil Engineers of Paris discussed the subject of Isthmian canals. M. Cotard and M. Lavalley, who had been employed on the Suez Canal, pointed out the advantages of the Nicaragua over the Panama Canal route. It was stated at the time that M. de Lesseps appeared unexpectedly, and appealed to the Society to discontinue the discussion, as it would be greatly to the injury of French interests. His power at that time is shown in the fact that this unreasonable request was complied with. I subsequently received a letter from an eminent engineer of that Society, who stated that I had little conception what professional injury one would suffer by incurring the displeasure of M. de Lesseps.

In August, books for subscriptions to the stock were opened with great *éclat* in Europe and in the United States. Soon after they were closed it was announced that, "as the amount subscribed was insufficient the subscribers were at liberty to withdraw the money paid in." The *Canal Bulletin* did not give the number of shares of stock subscribed, but an estimate published at the time stated it roughly at two per cent. M. de Lesseps, however, was by no means at his wits' end. He determined to go to Panama "to see for himself." He would then be able to inform the public just what the canal would cost, and, to insure this, took several engineers with him as well as two contractors, Couvreux and Hersenlt, who had done work on the Suez Canal. Soon after his arrival at Panama he expressed his great satisfaction with the physical conditions, although a disastrous flood of the Chagres River was just subsiding. He also reported that the climate was delightful and healthful, and, perhaps to accentuate this idea, he took one of his daughters with him. On the way to the United States he found ample time to revise the estimates of his engineers, which amounted to seven or eight hundred million francs, which was a large reduction of the estimate given in the Paris Canal Congress. He stated that he had a substantial agreement with Couvreux and Hersenlt to execute the work for about five hundred and twelve millions of francs.

The success of the Suez Canal and the fortunes made by the investors in that stock quite crazed the credulous *rentiérs*, when they read the illusory personal presentations of M. de Lesseps, and saw his flaming advertisements everywhere. There was not a newspaper at that time, and for years thereafter, that did not give rosy accounts of the sea-level canal. Notwithstanding the statement of a substantial agreement as to cost of construction with Couvreux and Hersenlt, they appear thereafter only in the rôle of contractors, with many others, to do certain parts of the work at a given compensation per cubic metre.

In a narrow valley, where the canal is located from Matachin to the sea, is the Chagres River, and beyond, looking towards Panama, are abrupt hills over which the railroad passes at an elevation of 296 feet, with a summit cut of thirty feet. The proposed canal excavation is of much greater depth, this increase being necessary to avoid short curves. It was a hopeless task at best, and after several years strife against nature, we find M. de Lesseps so subdued that his "plans" were changed for a summit eleven metres higher than Menocal's project on the same locality, for a lockage of 124 feet above sea, which had a natural, but at times of drought, as was afterwards known, an insufficient supply from the waters of the upper Chagres, planned to be impounded at considerable cost. Compared with the grand resolution for a sea-level canal, the *sine quâ non* of Lesseps, a putative engineer, and a diplomat, there is something painfully grotesque in his later "plan" of providing means, as occasions would require, for pumping a water supply thirty-four feet to the summit—this in order to operate a ship canal to meet the requirements of the traffic of the world, as pointedly expressed in his resolution, adopted by his Congress!

In THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for January 1880 M. de Lesseps stated: "In the examination of different projects in the United States, the only plan thought of has been to make use of inland waters for constructing a maritime canal, and they have entirely neglected to study the methods by which they would secure a constant level of sea-water for the purposes of navigation in a channel cut from one ocean to the other."

Had M. de Lesseps examined the report of the Panama Canal survey, presented to the Paris Canal Congress, he would have

found the following in the instructions to Commander Lull from the Navy Department, December 29, 1872:

1. In relation to water supply, and the points whence it should be drawn for an interoceanic canal, if constructed on the Isthmus of Panama.
2. The difficulties that may exist from floods.
3. Actual locations of the most practicable line or lines, with location of locks, if the route upon examination should render this advisable.
4. Observation as to whatever in the way of material, or other conditions, which would look to the general question of construction, whether of advantage or disadvantage.

It will be seen from Lull's instructions in full that the "exclusively American Commission," of whom M. de Lesseps complains, asked for and obtained a survey of the Panama route *with reference to a sea-level canal*, and if this should be found impracticable with whatever lockage proved most advantageous. Yet on this very location M. de Lesseps supported enthusiastically, in the Paris Canal Congress, a "plan" for a sea-level canal based solely on a dozen cross-sections of the railroad and its profile.

On page 50, of H. R. Doc. 16, Forty-sixth Congress, third Session, will be found the testimony of M. de Lesseps before a select committee on the Interoceanic canal question. He stated: "If it were determined to build a lock canal, and if there could not be a canal between the two oceans except a lock canal, then there was no doubt that the Nicaragua route was the best route."

In reply to Mr. Hutchins, who asked how many vessels a day could pass through the Nicaragua canal, supposing it to have seventeen locks, M. de Lesseps stated that each lockage would require two hours, even if everything went well. Mr. Hutchins asked whether more than one steamer could pass through a lock at one time, to which M. de Lesseps replied in the negative. Mr. Hutchin said, according to that, not more than ten or twelve steamers a day could pass through the Nicaragua canal. M. de Lesseps assented; he would say fifteen as the greatest number that could pass the locks in one day. At the Paris Canal Congress, Sir John Hawkshaw said that he thought fifteen minutes ample time to pass a single large vessel through a lift lock.

On page 653 of the proceedings at the final sitting of the Congress, M. de Lesseps said: "Au moment de nous séparer, je dois vous avouer que je suis passé par bien des perplexités pendent le temps qu'a duré ce Congrès. Je ne pensais pas, il y a quinze jours, que je serais obligé de me mettre à la tête d'une en-

terprise nouvelle. Mes meillieurs amis ont voulu m'en dissuader, me disant qu'après Suez je devais me reposer. Eh bien ! si l'on demande à un général qui à gagnê une première bataille, s'il veut gagner une seconde, il ne peut pas refuser."

Had Mehemet Ali been a gifted engineer, instead of being gifted with duplicity in an extraordinary degree, when he had so apt and youthful a pupil as M. de Lesseps half a century later, perhaps half a million of persons who put their fortunes in the stock of the Panama sea-level canal would not have lost their last sous; and perhaps Dauzats, Bionne, Reclus, and a host of the other personal friends of *le grand Francais*, would not have fallen victims to the pestiferous climate of Panama, and tens of thousands of other persons would not have died there in a vain strife against the forces of nature.

Some years ago, a friend living in Paris wrote me of the popular idea that there were only two great men in France who were truly, sublimely great. One was General Boulanger, and the other M. de Lesseps. Subsequent years dispelled the illusion in relation to the former, and left not even a shadow of greatness.

In relation to M. de Lesseps, this pitiful recital of human frailty—certainly without criminal intent to ruin himself, and all of those nearest and dearest to him, as well as half a million of *rentiers*, who had a blind faith in him, and some tens of thousands of men who, assured by an authority they regarded omniscient, went to the Isthmus and died there—admonishes us to pause for reflection. It is not given to man to condemn, save in a judicial way, nor to pronounce culpability. An all-wise Creator can measure human actions far beyond the ken of man, and far beyond the decrees that belong to mundane existence.

It is an obligation that humanity should sympathize with those who suffer, and bow with reverence and humility to a Divine decree—not one that looks to other than benevolent consideration.—VENGEANCE IS MINE, SAITH THE LORD.

DANIEL AMMEN.

CHANGES IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

BY THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

THE last half century has seen changes as great in the Church as in the State of England, and it is only those who have seen them, and lived in the midst of them, who can realize how great these changes have been. It is to the Oxford movement that most of them are due. At the commencement of that period the most earnest and influential school of religious thought in the church was the Evangelical, of which the Rev. Chas. Simeon was the leader. The Oxford movement was in its infancy. The "Tracts for the Times," commenced ten years earlier, were beginning to attract attention as a possibly serious force in the future. Consequently against them men of very different schools of thought banded themselves together, though they could agree about little else. A good story that illustrates this is told of what happened at a dinner given by a leading Evangelical clergyman. The dinner was in May, when the societies favored by the Evangelical party hold their meetings in London. A fox-hunting parson was amongst the guests; the lady sitting next to him inquired whether he had been to any of these meetings, upon which, to the surprise of the company, the clergyman shouted out: "Meetings in May, Madam? Meetings in May? Hounds meet in May? Never heard of such a thing."

At that time the influence of the State in church matters was excessive. The power of governmental control which had hindered the Church from sending bishops to America a century before was felt to be paramount. Until the year 1819, no church could be built in England without an Act of Parliament authorizing its erection. The difficulty and expense of obtaining such an Act were great, and consequently at a time when population was

increasing at a rate never before known, not more than one or two churches were built annually, and good sort of ignorant Church people erected dissenting chapels to preserve the people from lapsing into heathenism. As the State then hindered Church expansion on the one side, so it thought to protect Church interests on the other by degrading the sacrament of Holy Communion into a test for civil office. The Test and Corporation Act required every officer in the army or navy, every candidate for the office of Alderman or Mayor of a corporate town, and for many other positions, to bring a certificate of having received the Holy Communion at church before he could be admitted to office; whilst the Roman Catholics were excluded from public positions of all kinds by the oath which the law required them to take. It would be difficult to invent two more effective hindrances to the growth of the Church's spiritual influence than those just named.

Between 1819 and 1840 these State arrangements for the Church had been happily swept away and a strong antagonism to her claims and position had been aroused. A popular Prime Minister had bidden the Bishops set their house in order, leaving them to complete the sentence. The Bishops in times of political excitement were mobbed and insulted on the streets. As an example of what was done it may be mentioned that whilst the Bishop of London was laying the first stone of a church in a poor neglected part of his diocese, a bull was turned loose amongst the people gathered to see the ceremony. Ten Irish sees were suppressed, and each year was expected to see more far reaching changes.

When we turn from the political aspect of the Church's affairs to the condition of her sacred buildings and services and her hold upon the spiritual thought of the country we find very much what might be expected. Her temporalities had been rigorously defended in the past, but there had been no thought of making them effective for the spiritual edification of the people. Pluralities were almost universal. Benefices were looked upon as estates to be held by men in Holy Orders, rather than as cures of souls. So lately as 1820 one man held the Deanery of St. Paul's with the Bishopric of Lincoln, both being well endowed; and he provided for one of his sons by giving him a canonry at Lincoln and another at Winchester and several benefices in

different parts of the country, and for another son in a somewhat similar manner. The men who could thus accumulate to themselves spiritual offices, or rather the income of spiritual offices, could not be expected to be very regardful of the spiritual interests of their flocks. Ill-paid curates were placed in charge of the parishes in which the Rector did not reside ; and it was a rare thing for a parish, however large or populous, to have more than one clergyman to minister to its wants. The consequence was that only the routine duties required by law were discharged, anything beyond that was considered superfluous. There was no aggressive action on the part of the Church against the unbelief and practical materialism that were growing up on all sides. The sick and the dying were uncared for, the people were unvisited, the children were untaught, the most solemn services of the Church were so negligently performed as to be productive of evil rather than good ; whilst the social improvement and well-being of the poorer members of society were unthought of. There were, of course, many exceptions to this state of things. There were earnest, devoted clergymen laboring for the spiritual welfare of their people, who mourned over the miserable condition to which the Church was reduced, and who sacrificed themselves and their fortunes to make full proof of their ministry. Such men were exceptions, but they happily existed. They were looked upon as enthusiasts, and were carefully excluded from the important positions of the Church by those in authority. For the most part they were found in benefices with incomes too small to tempt the cupidity of worldly-minded men.

The condition of the churches was as unattractive as neglect could make them. There was no thought of decoration, no effort to beautify them. They were filled with appropriated pews, the sides of which were sometimes so high as effectively to hinder their occupants being seen by the rest of the congregation. In some country churches the squire's seat was fitted up as a parlor, with a table and chairs and a fireplace, and with curtains to hide the occupants from the view of the rest of the congregation. Nor were the services more attractive. There was no chanting, hymns were unknown, a metrical Psalm was sometimes sung, with the accompaniment of an orchestra that must have been intolerable to musical ears ; opportunity being furnished for this outburst of song by the clergyman retreating

into the vestry to exchange the surplice in which he had read the prayers for the black gown in which he was to preach. The people rarely joined in the responses, while the Psalms for the day were read alternately by the parson and clerk. Little provision was made for the poor, and dullness was the prevailing feature of the service. There was little to distinguish the church from the meeting-house, except that its services were colder, and its sermons more scholarly and correct, but much less exciting and amusing. In the eastern counties it was no uncommon thing for one clergyman to serve three or even four churches, one hurried service a week being given to each. In Lincolnshire it was very rare to find a clergyman serving only one parish; if not a pluralist, he would give one service, alternately morning and evening, in the church where he was rector, and then provide the same amount of spiritual ministration as curate to some non-resident incumbent in a neighboring parish. Even in such cathedrals as St. Paul's, London, where there was great reason for more being done, there are many who can recollect the verger coming to them and saying he hoped they would not give the minor canon the trouble of celebrating the Holy Communion for their benefit, as he would have to do if they did not withdraw. The week-day services in cathedrals were compulsorily maintained, but the choirs and clergy attended so irregularly and behaved so irreverently as effectually to keep worshippers away. There were few churches in which Holy Communion was celebrated more frequently than once a month.

Under these grave conditions, when the old defences for the Church Establishment had been swept away, and when a government hostile to the Church was in power, schemes of all kinds were suggested for ending or mending the Church. The wildest proposals for altering the Prayer Book were freely canvassed, and the crisis seemed so near at hand that an influential Churchman wrote: "I would have little or no fear if I thought we could stand for ten or fifteen years as we are." But such an anticipation seemed out of the question. As an illustration of the extent to which this feeling pervaded the country, and was seriously contemplated by men in a position to take a fair view of what was likely to happen, I may mention what happened with regard to a valuable estate belonging to the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's. It had been leased for 300 years to the Corporation of

London, and the lease was on the point of expiring. Land that had been open fields when the lease was granted had been covered with valuable buildings. It was discussed in the Corporation solicitor's office what should be done to obtain a renewal of the lease. After discussion it was determined that nothing should be attempted, for it was said: "We shall soon have the cow, why care for the calf;" in other words, the cathedral and all its belongings will soon be confiscated; why trouble about a fragment of its property.

Such was the state of things viewed from the outside. Looked at from within there were defenders unequal to contend against the enemies who surrounded them. Those who had leaned on the arm of the State, and their name was legion, had lost the power on which they had relied for protection. Evangelicals were earnest and zealous, but their theology was too narrow, too much like that of the sects who were assailing the Church, to make it possible for them to rear an effective barrier of defence; and there was a liberal school, of which Dr. Arnold was a leading member, who were prepared to surrender all that was distinctive in the church teaching to unite in one body with the dissenters. All this has to be borne in mind if people would rightly estimate what has been accomplished in the English Church during the last half century. Then it was that a few earnest men keenly felt that the only path of safety and of truth for the Church was boldly to reassert the principles for which her more earnest defenders had contended in days gone by, the principles for which Archbishop Laud had been content to die, and which had marked the writings of great divines in the Elizabethan and Caroline periods. Foremost amongst these there was John Keble, a man of great literary attainments, a double-first class man at Oxford, a tutor of his college, a poet, but shy and retiring, not formed to lead a party, preferring the quiet of a small country curacy to the more prominent life of Oxford with its possibilities of future eminence. To train some future clergymen who might benefit the Church, he took charge of several young Oxford men in the vacations, to whom he acted as tutor in the country, and from whom he would never receive any payment. Amongst their number were Hurrell Froude, Isaac Williams and others. The first of these was destined to play an important part in the few years of life that were allotted him.

He was impulsive, enthusiastic, somewhat reckless in stating what he held to be true, not averse to controversy, unselfish, indifferent to worldly interests. On him Keble's teaching had the greatest influence; it completely moulded him in the religious principles of his instructor. As a fellow of Oriel College he gradually became intimate with Newman, who had begun life as an evangelical, and had then been attracted by Whateley, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, and his liberal school. At that period of his life he had so little sympathy with that school of thought in the English Church with which he was afterwards identified that he had secured the election of Dr. Hawkins as Provost of his college by defeating Keble. Through his friendship with Froude he became intimate with Keble after a time, and supplied what was needed to make the enterprise on which he embarked successful, and now these friends, together with some others, resolved to do whatever could be done to persuade churchmen to rest the defence of the Church upon the principles just spoken of. At first Dr. Pusey stood aloof from them, but after a time he took an active and important part in their proceedings.

This great venture was the publication of a series of tracts, well known since as "Tracts for the Times." The first of these, written by Newman, bears date September 7, 1833, and the special principle for which these publications were to contend is thus set forth in that tract which was primarily addressed to the clergy: "There are some who elect their Divine mission on their own unsupported assertion; others who rest it upon their popularity; others on their success; and others who rest it upon their temporal distinctions. This last case has perhaps been too much our own. I fear we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built—*our apostolical descent.*" To establish this, and what follows upon it, the divine character of the Church, its independence of the State in all that relates to its doctrine and discipline, was the one aim of the Tract writers, as it has been of those who have followed their teachings.

At first this teaching made little way. When the government of the day desired to force the University to receive dissenters, a stand was made against the attempt chiefly by these men, and Denison, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, accidentally meeting Newman at the time, said to him: "To make a stand against the government

by a handful of men here is absurd. What do they care for you? They will only despise you." But they had resolved to go by faith, to do what they believed right regardless of what the result might be, and they counted the cost. They knew that by so doing they forfeited all prospect of fame or success in their profession, and that they must give up all thought of what is most attractive in this life—promotion, wealth, comfort. Slowly they won their way. The example of their holy, self-denying lives had an attraction which enthusiastic and religiously disposed young men could not resist; and seven years later when I entered the University of Oxford nearly the whole of the religious life of the younger members studying there was being influenced by them.

One way in which that life showed that the men who accepted it were in earnest, was that they regarded obedience to all college and university regulations, as not less part of their religious obligations than seeking for the teaching in which they took more interest and pleasure. Instead of college chapel being regarded as an irksome disciplinary regulation, undergraduates attended twice in each day instead of the once that was obligatory, the college fellows and tutors who agreed with the Tract writers setting them the example. The solitary celebration of Holy Communion in college chapel during each term was supplemented by a weekly celebration at St. Mary's (of which church Newman was Vicar) at 7 o'clock, and it is pleasant to recall the appearance of Dr. Pusey and others who were never absent, some of whom had evidently found but scant time to attend to their toilet. Then it was no uncommon thing to find men who took a Sabbatarian view of their religious duties and practically spent the whole day in fulfilling them. Holy Communion at 7, prayers in College Chapel at 8, University sermon at 10, and also at 2, Newman's service at St. Mary's at 4, when most of his Parochial sermons, subsequently published, were preached, and then prayers in College Chapel at 7. Religion became the dominant principle in Oxford. I can truly say that in no other place have I ever seen such attention to its outward requirements; fasts and festivals were strictly observed; theology was studied to such an extent that the writings of the fathers in old editions became difficult to procure, even at greatly increased prices. There was an enthusiasm that seemed to carry everything before it. The sad reflection is that in looking back one has to mourn

over so many friends, with whom one was then entirely in accord, who have strayed into other paths, some having deserted to Rome, others having adopted what are euphemistically termed liberal views of religion; all of them having been more or less shaken by the subsequent action of Mr. Newman. At the time I am speaking of, it was known that to sympathize with the views of the Tract writers would be looked upon with the greatest disfavor by the rulers of the University and those outside it. The Provost of Oriel cross-questioned every candidate for a fellowship in his college on the subject, and made it certain that his opposition would be assured against all disciples of this school, whatever their qualifications might be, and he emphasized his opinions by practically dismissing from their tutorships some of the more distinguished writers of the Tracts. The heads of some of the colleges altered the dinner hour on Sundays, so as to make it impossible for the men to attend Newman's service at 4 o'clock; and it was understood that rustication might follow if a man failed to dine in hall on that day. Fanatical clergymen came to preach in their turn before the University and took the opportunity of denouncing the teaching of the Tracts and their writers; one preacher, more zealous than wise, took for his text: "They wax fat; they shine," applying these words to the writers of the hated publications, whilst the thin, ascetic forms of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman were seen below the pulpit, to the intense amusement of the congregation.

There was nothing in the ceremonial employed by Mr. Newman and his friends to distinguish it from what was practised elsewhere, except that the services were more reverent. At the early celebrations at St. Mary's an old custom was continued that I have never seen elsewhere. The communicants were ranged round the stalls of the long chancel, and white cloths were spread on the desk for books before them; there they remained, and the celebrant and his assistant went round administering the sacred elements to them.

There were one or two memorable scenes in church. When Newman was preaching his last University sermon, which was on Development, he startled the crowded congregation by saying: "Thus Protestantism has unexpectedly developed into polygamy," referring, no doubt, to the case of Philip, Prince of Hesse, Luther's defender. It seemed as though an electric shock

had passed through the church. Not less remarkable was the scene at Littlemore, where he preached his last sermon in the English Church. His subject was the parting of friends, and as in calm, unimpassioned words he poured out eloquent descriptions of such partings there was not a dry eye in the church. Strong men like Dr. Pusey and Jack Maurice sobbed aloud; the church literally rang with the sound of their weeping, and gave such an illustration to the words "he lifted up his voice and wept" as I had never witnessed before. When the sermon was finished, the preacher came down from the pulpit, took off his University hood and threw it over the altar rails, as much as to say, Now my office as a teacher has come to an end.

Another remarkable day at an earlier period was that which succeeded the publication of "Tract 90." The whole University was wild with excitement. Four well-known tutors had signed an appeal to the Vice-Chancellor, asking for its condemnation, and their appeal was posted at the buttery hatch of all the colleges. A crisis was evidently at hand. In a few hours the first edition was exhausted, and men rushed eagerly about seeking to borrow a copy from any friend who had been so fortunate as to secure one. I remember one of my college friends, who was helping Newman, rushing up to me to beg for the sight of a copy, saying, "I hear we are to be burned. I should like to know what for before it happens."

After the events just named, it was felt that the whole aspect of affairs was changed. Men said the Oxford movement is shipwrecked. There was distrust where there had been confidence. A reaction had set in, and no one could tell how far it would go. Some men deserted to Rome; others felt disinclined to trouble themselves further about religion. It was a shock to find that, after all, Newman had doubts about his position, though no hint to that effect had been publicly given in his sermons or elsewhere. The question was asked, Did the religious excitement of the last few years represent real convictions, or was it only a mere academical discussion? After all that Newman had said against Rome, will he become a convert? Earnest, enthusiastic young men who had yielded to the influence of his teaching, felt sick at heart; they did not know what to do. If what they had learned was not true, they felt there was nothing true. It seemed to them for the moment that they had been deceived. Fierce attacks were

made on the movement from all sides, and he who had been the leader was like Achilles, sulking in his tent. Those outside his intimate circle of friends could only guess what would happen; whilst his intimates, as we now know from recent publications, could never have had a doubt what the end would be. Still, when the end came, it was a shock to them, as I learned from a friend of his who showed me a letter from him announcing his submission to the Church of Rome, which was the first intimation I had of that event.

When he was gone it was found, after a time, that he had taken with him much fewer people than might have been anticipated. Of all the writers of the "Tracts for the Times," he was the only one who left the communion of the Church of England, and he was the only one of the number who had been educated in Low Church traditions. The shock that had been given was eventually found to have been far less injurious than was at first supposed. It had compelled earnest men to examine how far they were leaning upon principles and how far upon the influence of a teacher whom they reverenced. The former remained steadfast; the latter fell off to the right and to the left. Men like Dr. Pusey came more to the front, and soon obtained the confidence of those who had been influenced by the teachings of the Tracts. After a time a new phase came over the movement. Some enthusiastic men thought that oral teaching ought to be enforced by a corresponding ceremonial. They revived vestures that had long been unused; they adopted a ceremonial beyond that of which churchmen generally could approve. They aroused a fierce antagonism; and every instrument by which their opponents could hope to overwhelm them was unscrupulously set in motion. It would be difficult to defend the consistency of the judgment of the law courts in cases where their aid was sought to suppress the practices objected to. In one point only did these judgments agree, and that was in not favoring innovations. Parliament was besieged with petitions to put down these so called troublers of Israel; a Royal Commission that sat for three and a quarter years was appointed to examine the question and report upon what could be done, and their report was on the popular side. Legislation was attempted and one Act was passed, which was expected to crush the movement. But no weapons that were forged against it prospered. In spite of everything that was done, its influence in

the country increased ; its opponents after a time practisd many of the observances against which they had at first vigorously protested. Throughout, the disciples of the movement consistently held to the paramount importance of the truth, which they felt had been intrusted to them, and defended the principle for the support of which the writers of the "Tracts for the Times" had commenced their publication. The principle was that the Church was not a branch of the State, but that it was responsible for making its own laws and enforcing its own discipline. Men were found willing to suffer imprisonment and the loss of all things, rather than yield a hair's breadth in a matter which they felt to be vital. They were content to be condemned unheard in a civil court, rather than give their sanction, as they felt it would be, to the right of such courts to interfere in such matters, by pleading before them. Without examining the wisdom, or the want of wisdom, of what they said and of what they did, it must be acknowledged that this result has been attained. The principle for which they contended has been accepted to a great extent by the mass of English people. The Church has obtained a real living influence such as it did not possess ; its claims to a Divine authority have been realized by foes as well as friends ; and if its enemies are more actively hostile, and more determinately set upon its destruction than they were, its friends are infinitely more resolved to do whatever can be done to make its spiritual power and influence more widely felt, and to secure that it should be worthy to become in reality, what it is in name, the Church of the Nation.

ROBERT GREGORY.

CRIMINAL LAW IN FRANCE.

BY MADAME ADAM.

DURING a recent visit to Aix in Provence I found the country in a state of excitement over a case about to be tried at the assizes, members of the most united families being divided into hostile camps: those who thought "Cauvin guilty," and those who thought "Cauvin innocent." To throw light on my faith, I listened, I inquired. Before the verdict was rendered, I formed an opinion of my own from reading the newspapers. I felt that Cauvin was guilty. After the verdict, the accounts of those who witnessed the trial, the absolute lack of any proof of the prisoner's guilt, and the reading of his lawyer's plea, led me to believe Cauvin innocent.

I shall relate the story of the Cauvin case at the close of this sketch, but meanwhile my readers may share my desire to understand the workings of criminal law in France. The idea that an innocent man had been condemned so moved me that I was anxious to know what guarantees my country's justice offered to any poor fellow who might be *accused, arraigned, and convicted,*—the three stages through which a criminal or supposed criminal passes.

Before I made this study of French legal methods I was shocked by what I may call the moral torture inflicted on the accused by the examining magistrate, which stirred me to revolt. I was sincere in thinking of the great degree of inferiority of a poor, ignorant wretch, to whom words are traps, who knows not how or what to answer, who finds himself drawn by the judge into a network of contradictions, who has often almost forgotten what he did on a certain day, at a certain hour, after the lapse of weeks or months, who gets all in a muddle, contradicts himself, and persists in what seems a stupid line of defence, when

we compare him with the logical man, the sensible, intelligent judge, eagerly bent on incriminating the culprit, and who is convinced that he has found and cornered him. I felt that verily in this, our free and equal land, there was a flagrant inequality between a country bumpkin cross-examined by the examining magistrate and a professor of rhetoric accused of the same crime.

I do not know how *causes célèbres* are conducted in America, but in France we all lose our heads, discuss the probability of guilt, argue the case one way or the other, discover or deny proofs, and, if we see any possibility of innocence, a mighty current of thought is formed which sways the press and might well influence anybody, however constituted, whether politician or otherwise, but which, incomprehensible as it may seem, has no power over the French magistracy.

What is this magistracy and what does it represent? What sacred power does it exert? What high ideal inspires it? What code of morality guides it? Whom does it feel that it defends?

In America and in England a magistrate recognizes in himself no right to prejudge a case. The accused, until he is found guilty, is innocent in the eyes of an English or American judge, who treats him as such and often helps him to clear himself. In France, on the other hand, the magistrate defends society against crime and strives to wring a confession from the prisoner before he is convicted. The person accused, considered as the one upon whom the burden of suspicion and accusal rests, must furnish proof of his innocence at the outset of proceedings against him, or else he must appear at the assize court, his accusers being the magistrates who have studied his case.

The perfect type of a judge in France, of a magistrate in whatsoever degree he may be invested with the power to interpret and apply the law, is that of a man of high, incorruptible moral worth, filled with profound respect for the judicial power which he wields, and with veneration for the laws.

To a French magistrate the laws seem meant to insure the reign of peace among men—a noble principle—for the realization of which he labors with kindness but at the same time with firmness; for if peace is to reign among men the laws must be obeyed, whether voluntarily or by force. Magistrates obey a higher authority, the living image of the arsenal of the laws, namely, Justice. They serve justice by executing her decrees

Justice has, for many ages, been represented with a pair of scales in one hand that she may weigh with the utmost precision the rights of all those who approach her sanctuary, and with a sword in the other that force may, if necessary, insure the execution of her decrees. With scales alone justice would be a mere personification of impotency; with the sword without the scales, she would be the personification of brute force. Without justice, without her constitution, without her official and efficacious machinery, laws would be of no avail, since they might be violated with impunity. Justice is, therefore, a necessary institution. In order that she may fulfil her destined end she must be ever ready to be set in motion by those who impersonate her, nay, more, she must never under any pretext refuse her aid.

Article IV. of the French Civil Code declares that "the judge who shall refuse to utter judgment on the plea that the law is silent, absurd or insufficient, may be prosecuted as guilty of refusal to administer justice." A judge, therefore, must enforce the law, even should it seem to him false and unjust—*dura lex, sed lex.* But, you may ask, will not his conscience rebel? No. A judge is a priest of Justice, he cannot dispute her dogma. If the sentence which he pronounces be unjust, his conscience cannot be burdened, for the blame rests with the legislator.

The judge is appointed to judge according to the law, and not to judge the law. D'Argentré has said that a man must be mad to think himself wiser than the law. Can we conceive of a judge free not to enforce the law because he happens to consider it unjust? That would be the source of the gravest abuses. There would be no more law. It would be replaced by the conscience of the judge. If each judge understood equity after his own fashion there would be almost as many versions of equity as there are judges.

The legislator, therefore, is alone responsible. The mouthpiece of the social interest of the general interests, he enacts laws in view of those interests. As for the judge, he is merely the mouthpiece of private interests; he is charged with but one special duty—to cut short any conflict which may arise between individual interests.

Thus we see that the law is binding on all citizens, but the judge's decision is binding only on those who are concerned in the case. The legislator has the initiative of the laws, the judge

has only that of his own decisions ! The first has the power to modify the laws which he has made, to any extent, but it is a singular fact, and one which, in my opinion, makes him at once the superior and inferior to the legislator, the judge can never change a sentence which he has once pronounced ! It ceases to belong to him from the moment that he utters it. It becomes final, unalterable, so far as he is concerned, and can only be modified by other jurisdictions.

The functions of the legislator and of the judge are, therefore, so wholly unlike, that it was highly imperative that they should be confided to different powers. Montesquieu tells us that "There is no freedom if the power to judge be not separated from legislative power." Every successive constitution in France since 1789 has held this principle sacred. So, too, Article V., of our Civil Code, reads thus : "All judges are forbidden to decide by any standard and universal rule in such cases as may be submitted to them." This requires explanation.

Under the old French monarchy, in old French law, before the Revolution, our famous Parliaments, powerfully and authoritatively, though they more than once resisted the king, constantly strove to encroach upon the privileges of the legislator. Whenever it was possible, they rendered a standard and universal decision, known as a decree (*arrêt*), in such cases as were submitted to them. Not only did these Parliaments judge the case in hand, but they declared that they should always, in future, decide similarly and after the same fashion in all like cases, and they ordered courts under their jurisdiction to do the same. Was this law ? They were, however, subject to the pleasure of the king ; hence the conflicts with which our history is filled.

Now let us see how justice proceeds from the moment a crime is discovered.

The public prosecutor appointed to check crimes, misdemeanors and offences, seeks out and pursues offenders. Crime is an act punished by law by a penalty either at once afflictive and ignominious, such as death, hard labor, transportation and solitary confinement, or merely ignominious, as banishment and civic degradation. In France all crimes are tried by the assize courts. A special offence, however, such as the famous Boulanger affair, may be referred to the Superior Court (*Haute-Cour*), as may also such crimes as high treason and attempts against the person

of the chief executive power or against the safety of the State.

The public prosecutor, whose appointment is a pledge for the safety of every citizen, is invested with a double power called *actions* or *suits*. The first, known under the name of *criminal action*, protects society whose order the criminal has disturbed; the second, *civil action*, protects the members of that society and defends them against offenders who have injured their interests.

When a crime is committed, the public prosecutor, that is, the attorney-general of a court of appeal or the ordinary attorney of a lower court, repairs to the scene of the crime, to collect all the information he can discover, and on his return directs the examining magistrate to draw up the bill of indictment. The latter, in his turn, searches for the culprit, questions the witnesses, and orders the arrest of all suspicious persons. He is invested with unlimited power in order to ascertain the truth.

When the guilty person, or the one suspected to be such, is caught, and when the judge has heaped upon his head all the proofs which condemn him or seem to condemn him (and this is where my sensibilities are again aroused and I tremble for the innocent man), the poor terrified wretch, seeing the charges which overwhelm him, may feel that he is deserted by all; but at this point the judge closes his examination and hands over the brief to the attorney-general in order that the judicial grand jury (*Chambre des mises en accusation*) may decide upon the further conduct of the case.

In reply to the alarm which I have just expressed, I give a decree of the Court of Appeal, dated June 28, 1839:

"Let us here be permitted to combat a serious and persistent error which is, however, beginning to die out, thanks to the better diffusion of knowledge. We refer to the gratuitous and injurious idea that as the prosecutor always acts for the prosecution, as he sees criminals on every hand, he can only form harsh conclusions if he is to be consistent with the purpose of his appointment, and that, regarding every acquittal as a defeat, he considers every conviction as but one success the more. Those who have a more correct idea of his high functions know that, as the defendant of all interests, it is his duty to protect even those of the person accused when they seem endangered, and to act or decide only to assure the triumph of justice and truth."

With the judicial grand jury the innocent prisoner begins to feel more certain that his innocence will be recognized. The attorney-general may, perhaps, have been influenced by countless incidents or evidences while at the scene of the crime, and the judge may be led astray by some false scent during the examina-

tion, but with the grand jury actual facts alone speak and plead with men whom nothing can influence. This grand jury differs from other branches of the Court of Appeal, which are composed of seven counsellors, in that it consists of but five. It decides whether or not the prisoner shall appear before the Assize Court.

Allow me to interrupt this somewhat serious description of justice in France to relate a piquant adventure which befell a friend of mine, M. Henry Machemin, examining magistrate and now assistant judge of the common law court at Nice. One of his villas at Toulon was entered and various valuable articles, including clothes and jewelry, were stolen. There was no evidence that the house had been broken into ; the door had simply been opened with the key which was inside. An examination of the premises revealed the fact that the thief, with unparalleled daring and audacity, had contrived to climb upon the roof, and, at the risk of breaking his neck, had entered through an open skylight, had quietly spent the night in the house, and, after eating and drinking such delicacies as he found, dressed himself from head to foot, and left his rags, carefully hung up in the dressing room. To cap the climax he left behind him a card on which was written : "You who are so clever, Judge Machemin, find out who I am if you can."

The judge's rage and desire to discover the rogue may be easily imagined. He left no stone unturned. The whole constabulary took the field. Every known receiver of stolen goods was searched. The police joined in the quest heart and soul, but for a whole year no clue was discovered. Meanwhile Judge Machemin unravelled the most intricate cases, ferretted out the most undiscoverable criminals and received the reward of his merits, being made chief judge of the civil court at Nice.

One day while he was on the bench a well-dressed fellow was brought before him, charged with theft.

"Excuse me," said the judge, "but would you hand me your hat ?"

"Highly flattered," said the prisoner, "that you should wish the address of my hatter."

"I should also like that of your tailor ; please hand me your overcoat."

"With pleasure ; will you have my shirt and trousers too ?"

"That is not necessary," replied the judge. "I know where

they come from, as well as your shoes and probably your stockings. I am Judge Machemin from whom you stole them."

The man never flinched. "Well, sir," he said, "I must admit that your clothes were of excellent make. They have done me good service, but your shoes were only tolerable, they wore out in six months."

The judge could not help laughing.

"No offence," said the thief, who saw that his victim was not too irascible; "I confess that I took very few carriages and walked a great deal in them."

"Well, I have found you out at last," said the judge, "and you shall pay for your insolence, as well as for the many crimes of which you are accused."

"You did not find me out, sir; I must insist upon that. Chance delivered me into your hands, that is all. It was inevitable, since I allowed myself to be caught; but if I had known that you were to judge me I should have chosen a different court. You know that I never steal for the mere sake of stealing; I steal when my clothes and my resources require renewing; I am a philosopher."

As told by the Judge, this story is one of the funniest I ever heard.

We have now reached the point where the prisoner is about to appear before the jury. How is a jury made up and in what manner is it recruited? The law reads: "Every Frenchman in the enjoyment of his civil and political rights may be a juror." Now, what are we to understand by civil and political rights? Rights in general are the advantages which the law accords to individuals of one and the same nation. Political rights are those of private individuals in their relations with the State. These rights are more important in that the working of public affairs depends upon the majority. In America, in France, and in Switzerland citizens have the most extensive political rights, since each man may form an integral part of the State and become a legislator. Civil rights are those of individuals to each other.

The jurors are drawn by lot in the country town of each department from lists prepared by justices of the peace. Save in pressing cases, duly established and attested, twelve jurors and two supplementary jurors are forced to obey their summons.

The supplementary jurors do not sit unless some one of the twelve is taken ill or is incapacitated by night sessions in the jury room (*salle des délibérations*). When any malefactor of the vicinity, who is reputed to be dangerous, is to be tried, one whose relatives threaten the jurymen, or whose accomplices are not yet discovered, as, for instance, a Ravachol, we may imagine the excitement that reigns among peaceful citizens and timid peasants whom everything alarms.

The assize court is composed of an assize judge and two assistant judges. The jury are seated in the court room to the right of the judge. They have no special costume, but wear their ordinary dress. Sometimes they appear in blouses. The prisoner faces the jury. They ask no direct questions, but may interrogate the prisoner or witnesses, through the judge, on any point likely to afford them information, and may also demand to see all articles offered in evidence by the public prosecutor to prove the prisoner's guilt. They hear the argument of the public prosecutor, who pleads for the indictment which he has prepared, and then those of the defence, and form a truly enlightened opinion from the depositions of the witnesses on both sides. When the trial is concluded the judge, in the presence of the court, reads to the jury the questions which are submitted to them, and reminds them of the duties which they are to perform. It is usually a question of the honor or dishonor of a family; of life or death for a fellow man. In the centre of the room is a long table with six separate partitions or boxes on each side. At the head of the table is a box for the foreman, containing a wooden urn.

From the moment the jury enter this room they are alone. The foreman puts the questions to them and they discuss them. The jury is usually divided into two almost equal camps. There are the indulgent ones, who answer the most incontrovertible evidence with the everlasting "What does that prove?" and there are those who, even when the crime is but ill-proved, declare that "society must be rid of such people." The foreman finds it hard to seize the opportune moment when the jury are almost agreed in their readiness or reluctance to vote one way or the other. Then he states the question anew. The jurymen seat themselves at the table, each in his box, where he cannot see what his neighbors write. One by one they rise and place

their folded ballots in the urn. The form of the ballot is: "Upon my honor and my conscience I declare that," etc.

When it is impossible for them to agree, the judge is called in to assist. My noble old friend, Raoul Duval, ex-judge of the court at Bordeaux, once told me that he was called to the aid of a jury at a time when education was far from universal in France, and was asked how they were to cast their votes, for the foreman had no better idea than the eleven other jurymen, nor had any of them understood the questions which the judge read over to them in the court room, and which it was their duty to answer. Raoul Duval said: "You must each write on your ballot, 'Upon my honor and my conscience, I declare that such an one is or is not guilty.'" All but one wrote literally: "Upon my honor and my conscience, such an one *is or is not* guilty!" He was obliged to explain afresh that a man cannot be at the same time *guilty* and *not guilty*.

Another friend of mine, from lower Brittany, related to me that being empanelled upon a jury, and being aware, owing to circumstances which he could not reveal, of the entire innocence of the prisoner whose fate he and his colleagues were called upon to decide, he strove in vain to persuade them to bring in a verdict of "not gullty," but despaired of ever doing so. Luckily the prisoner's name was Mary. Struck by a sudden inspiration he exclaimed: "A descendant of the Virgin Mary cannot be guilty. Come, what do you say?" All voted for an acquittal!

The verdict rendered, the foreman signs and dates it. The jury then return to the court room. The spectators are ordered to bare their heads. The prisoner, who had been removed, is brought back to hear the sentence. After this final moving formality, the jury have done their work in that particular case. If they bring in an acquittal the case is ended; if they decide that the prisoner is guilty, with or without extenuating circumstances, it is for the judges to impose the penalty provided by law.

The case which led me to all these dissertations on law, justice, and the French mode of procedure came up at the assize court at Aix in Provence. The court house in that interesting and curious old town, where memories of different periods of French history meet us at every turn, is a remarkable structure. To this most imposing building Cauvin was brought after a term of imprisonment on suspicion, his guilt

having been proved according to the process which I have already described.

A man above the common, living at home with his wife and her parents, a man of letters, an idealist, giving evening receptions of a literary character, reputed as one of the most honest and the best of men, Cauvin appeared last June before the jury of Aix, accused of strangling an old woman, a rich widow, his accomplice being a sixteen-year-old girl, the servant of the murdered woman.

What was the motive for this crime?

The prosecution showed that the woman was his benefactress, that she had brought him up and had made a will in his favor. Disputes arising between them, Mme. Mouttel was said to have threatened to alter her will in favor of a brother whom she had disinherited for Cauvin. During the cross-examination, the maid, Marie Michel, who had been taken from a foundling hospital, and who was a girl of no moral character, gave three different versions of the murder, although she always declared that Cauvin had strangled Mme. Mouttel and that she had herself held the hands of her mistress. Cauvin absolutely denied the charge and his servant as well as his wife and her parents asserted that he did not leave the house until Mme. Mouttel's maid rang at his door to tell him that her mistress was dead. There was no evidence that Cauvin strangled Mme. Mouttel except the statement of the servant, who contradicted herself three separate times. Cauvin's lawyer was so convinced of his client's innocence that he threw his whole soul into his defence, and when the verdict was rendered sobbed aloud in court.

Popular opinion in and about Aix was divided into two contrary currents; one for and the other against Cauvin. A certain soldier, who left Aix to rejoin his regiment, and who was unable to explain how he passed his time during the night of the murder, was suspected by those who believed Cauvin innocent. Owing to lack of proof, the verdict condemning Cauvin to hard labor for life, and acquitting the girl, Marie Michel, as irresponsible, was set aside.

Our Court of Appeal, on the pretext of some flaw in the form, frequently sets aside a sentence which it considers ill-judged. When the Court of Appeal invalidates a verdict, the case is brought up again before another court, but one of the same

order and degree as that which originally tried it. The new court, to which the case is referred, retains entire freedom of action; it may confirm the first verdict or render another. In the latter case, a fresh appeal to the Supreme Court may be made.

If the verdict be again set aside by the Supreme Court, which on this occasion assembles all its branches—the Court of Petitions, Court of Common Law and Criminal Court—the tribunal to which the case is then referred *is to judge* as if it were the Court of Appeal. The law of April 1, 1837, declares that the opinion of the Supreme Court is final and prevails over that of any or all other courts or tribunals.

Cauvin will, therefore, be tried again at the next assizes. The verdict acquitting the girl, Marie Michel, however, cannot be reversed. She will, therefore, re-appear face to face with Cauvin, not as a prisoner, although she confessed that she was accessory to the crime, but merely as a witness.

Will fresh proof be brought forward for or against Cauvin? I do not doubt it, for, as we have seen, French justice controls and revises its own actions and moves without undue haste. If it be stern with the guilty in order to preserve society, it also allows the innocent the power and the means to prove their innocence.

JULIETTE ADAM.

BOONS AND BANES OF FREE SILVER.

I.—"IN THE INTEREST OF SHYLOCK."

BY THE HON. R. P. BLAND, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS AND MEASURES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THE adjournment of the Monetary Conference recently held at Brussels without any definite conclusions or agreements on the silver question is no disappointment or surprise to any one.

The Conference was not solicited by our Government with the view of any serious consideration of the matters involved. It was well known here and abroad that the moving cause of the conference on the part of our Government was to defeat or postpone legislation on the silver question, and to amuse and deceive the people, pending the Presidential election. Able and affable gentlemen met in debate, suggested vague and impossible plans, had a good time, and finally adjourned, expressing the hope that the junketing farce may be repeated in May.

Our delegates were met with the same arguments there that we are at all times regaled with here. These arguments were to the effect that the movement for the free coinage of silver, or any recognition of silver as a money metal is impracticable in view of the fact that the output of silver is so overwhelming as to endanger the stability of values, that our mines can be made to yield silver without limit, that the whole silver movement is prompted by the "Bonanza Kings;" that the people outside of the mining camps who are demanding the free coinage

of silver are lunatics who have not sufficient intelligence to know their own interests; that the government of the United States has loaded itself to the guards with this base metal and now seeks to induce and inveigle the unsuspecting foreigner to help "Uncle Sam" take care of the elephant. We need not go from home to hear these things. We ought not to be surprised that the story is repeated to us by the foreigner. From our own lips we stand condemned.

At last our astute diplomats become very grave and serious and pretend to get mad; they tell these ignorant foreigners that the United States will no longer try to hold the monetary world up by the tail, but will immediately cut the gordian knot in this caudal appendage and let the world drop with a leaden thud.

The unsophisticated foreigner smiles, our gold-standard delegate smirks; both understand that such a conclusion is precisely the thing they have plotted for. Hence the conclusion always arrived at is, that to coerce the unwilling foreigner we must return to the statesmanship of 1873, and again totally discard silver as money.

The trick will not work. Once thoroughly convince Europe that this country will not submit to silver demonetization; let us go to free coinage and the problem will be solved. The European interests here and the commercial importance of this country to them are too great to be ignored. Their self-preservation will compel them to join with us in the full restoration of silver. But so long as they can induce us to adopt a system advantageous to them and disadvantageous to ourselves we will get no encouragement from that quarter on the silver question.

We have had two experiences with respect to the plan of monetary conferences—the one held at Brussels just adjourned and the conference at Paris in 1878, and the second session of the same conference in 1881. The Paris conferences were held in pursuance of Act of Congress of February 28, 1878, the House of Representatives having passed a bill by more than two-thirds majority restoring silver to free coinage. The Senate amended the bill by limiting the coinage to Government account providing that the Secretary of the Treasury should purchase monthly not less than two million, nor more than four million dollars worth of silver and coin it into standard dollars as fast as purchased. The second section of this bill provided, instead of free coinage, that

the question of free coinage should be referred to international agreement, and authorized a conference to be held for that purpose.

The first session of this conference was begun at Paris on August 19, 1878, the second session at the same place April 19, 1881. No definite conclusions were reached or even hoped for at any of these conferences the main object of which was to stem the popular tide for the free coinage of silver in this country; to gain time and the opportunity to go back to the demonetization policy of 1873.

It would require too much space to trace the history of the silver question in this country since the act of February 28, 1878. It is well known that since the Paris conferences, the advocates of the single gold standard have continuously urged Congress to demonetize silver. Every administration has been hostile to silver. The governments of Europe have been repeatedly advised that we intended to discontinue our purchases.

The moneyed interests of Europe and the United States have been in a close league to stop our use of silver as money. They have resorted to every device, to every argument that ingenuity and misrepresentation could suggest, to induce the American people to abandon silver.

The proposition of Mr. Alfred de Rothschild for European governments to purchase annually five million pounds sterling of silver bullion at a price not to exceed 43 pence per ounce for five years, to cease such purchases at any time the price should exceed 43 pence per ounce, illustrates the position of the money power there and here. They do not intend that gold shall fall in value. It is the fall of gold that haunts them as the dreaded spectre of silver restoration.

Should silver go above its present level it would mean that gold had fallen. The truth is that silver bullion will buy as much of commodities to-day as ever; that it has not in fact fallen, for as silver goes down as compared to gold, so do all other things. The rise in silver would, and does, mean the rise of commodities, or, what is the same thing, the fall of gold. This is the true situation. It is not cheap silver they fear, but it is cheap gold they are battling against. They appreciate the fact that a full restoration of silver to its old relation to gold means the fall of gold; that the equalization of the two metals will

be reached by a fall in gold, and that the fall in the value of gold will be greater probably than the rise in silver.

Gold will fall and silver will rise in value, and meeting each other midway the parity is restored. The holders of stocks, bonds and mortgages and fixed incomes are determined there shall be no fall in gold. They must have the best money in the world—but another name for dearest and scarcest money in the world. On this line the battle rages, yet the gold advocates are artful enough to deceive many with the cry of cheap silver. They see gold going up from year to year; they see their pound sterling or their dollar increased in value. These increasing exactions on productive labor to pay their demands, measured by gold, increases from year to year. They shall not escape the logic of this situation by the deceptive slogan of cheap silver.

The Presidential election has passed; this monetary farce has ended; what next? It is hinted very broadly that the gold bugs are active, and that they are not at all satisfied with the present situation. Having defeated free coinage they are emboldened to attempt the total elimination of further silver purchases or coinage. Both the Democratic and Republican parties put the tariff question ahead of the silver question as the paramount issue in the last campaign. Since the election, however, the gold advocates in both parties now claim that the first pressing business for Congress to do is to settle the silver question upon the lines of the gold standard theory. They will be met, as they have heretofore been met, with the demand for the unlimited coinage of silver.

The Chicago or Democratic platform while favoring the repeal of the present silver law also favored unlimited coinage as a substitute. The ratio at which the two metals were to be coined was not fixed, but must necessarily be adjusted by Congress.

The fact that the silver dollar and the gold dollar are of the same value in purchasing power to-day would suggest the present ratio, the ratio practically existing since the formation of our government. The unlimited coinage of silver converts all bullion not otherwise used, as in the arts, etc., into interest-bearing money; the bullion thus utilized restores its value equal to the value of gold bullion, which now has a monopoly of this monetary function. This fact is shown by all past experience and history. The object lesson of nearly four thousand millions of silver money

maintaining a parity with a like amount of gold at 15½ to 1 in the monetary circulation of the world, as well as our own present condition, where we see about four hundred and twenty millions of silver dollars and certificates and a like amount of gold circulating side by side as equivalent, shows conclusively that there is no reason, equity or justice in the demand for more silver in the dollar. It shows also the animus of Mr. de Rothschild's proposition, that by international agreement silver bullion, as compared to gold, shall be doomed to its present degraded position.

The proposition of Mr. de Rothschild means that the ratio to be established by international agreement between gold and silver shall in effect require nearly thirty cents more silver in the dollar than in the present ratio. It means lthat the four thousand million dollars of silver now in circulation must be recoined or rated at a loss of thirty cents in the dollar. This would occasion a contraction of the world's money at one fell decree of one thousand two hundred million dollars. It would mean for us a contraction in our silver money of nearly one hundred and twenty-five millions of dollars. The proposition is monstrous. But it would go much further than this ; it would lay the confiscating hand on the product of silver for all the ages to come, by filching and contracting the coining value thirty cents in the dollar, or one-third.

All this is proposed in the interest of Shylock, that his gold shall not compete on equal terms with silver.

As further argument of the question of the ratio I beg to submit an extract from the article of the writer hereof in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, for July 1892, as follows :

In adopting a ratio for ourselves, or by concurrent action of other nations, the ratio of 15½ or our own ratio of 16 should be selected. First, because it is the ratio, or it approaches the ratio, that has existed in the commercial world for centuries, and at which the coined gold and coined silver of the nations circulate at par in the countries where coined. Secondly, this is about the average ratio at which the nations of the world coin gold and silver into legal tender money. Thirdly, it is near the relative amount in weight of the existing coined stock of the two metals.

The Director of tbe Mint gives the amount of gold money in the world at $3,711,845,000, of silver $3,939,578,000. Of this amount in silver he estimates $544,166,000 to be subsidiary or limited tender. This estimate is made upon the nominal value of the silver coins at the ratio or coining value of silver in the different countries where the stocks of silver money exist. Hence the average of full legal tender for silver would be about 15½ in weight of silver to 1 of gold. The limited tender or fractional silver would

be about 14 of silver to 1 of gold. So that it is apparent that the amount of silver money in the world is about 15½ times as great per weight of metal as that of gold.

If we take the product of gold from 1873 to 1891, as shown by the Director of the Mint last winter in hearings before our coinage committee of the House of Representatives, we find the product of gold in fine ounces to be about 98,606,925, and that of silver 1,512,174,000 in fine ounces. This shows a ratio of production per weight in fine ounces of about 15½ of silver to one of gold. The facts above show that of the gold and silver money throughout the world the ratio per weight of metal is about 15½ to 1.

The product from 1873 to the present time is about 15½ ounces of silver to one of gold, so that 15½ seems to be near the natural ratio. The fact that for the last four or five years the annual product of silver at this ratio has been greater than the product of gold does not mitigate against the argument. A series of years should be taken. The mines may, in a short time, show a greater product of gold than of silver. Even the occurrence of a disproportional product of one or the other of these metals for a series of years, as, for instance, of gold in excess of silver during the large output of California, and Australia, fails to disturb the plan of 15½. The annual product constitutes too small a per cent. of the vast stock of metals on hand to cause any perceptible fluctuations in values. The equity of contracts the world over demands 15½ or 16 as the ratio; since the coined silver money of the world rests at about these rates, and the debts of the world were and are contracted to be paid on this basis, it would be a robbery of debtors to demand more silver in the dollar. It would be unjust to debtors as well as to the welfare of future generations to limit the monetary functions of silver by increasing the amount of silver in the dollar. To first demonetize silver for the purpose of precipitating a rise in gold as compared with silver, and to seize upon this flagrant wrong as an excuse for readjusting the ratio in the interest of the money lenders of the present and the Shylocks of the future, ought not to be tolerated.

The late Secretary Windom, on page 73 of his report for 1887, well remarks in this connection: "The paramount objections to this plan, however, is that it would have a decided tendency to prevent any rise in the value of silver. Seizing it at its present low price the law would, in effect, declare that it must remain there forever, so far as its uses for coinage are concerned."

I was not an advocate of the enactment of the present silver law; on the contrary, I opposed it. First, because no compromise or makeshift was likely to satisfy the expectations of the people or do justice to them. Again, the law is based upon a wrong principle. But it is the only recognition of silver we have. It is a connecting link between total demonetization and free coinage, hence its repeal without other enactment will not do. Its enforcement will in time compel us to free coinage in order to maintain the value of our silver. Seeing this condition, the gold party are determined to stop the further accumulation of silver. On these lines the battle is to be fought.

If silver is not suitable for a place in our monetary system as a standard of money, the equal of gold, not a dollar of it ought to be coined. If it is a base metal, as Senator Sherman claims, and belongs to the category of nickel, copper and steel rails, we should say so in our statute books and relegate it where it belongs. Will Congress take this view of it? Will the people permit the total destruction of silver as a money metal? These are questions that must be answered.

The repeal of the present law without at the same time substituting some other recognition of silver as having a permanent place in our system as a money metal will, of course, mean its abandonment and final demonetization.

Will any political party take such a responsibility upon itself? If so, what class of the American people will it afterwards look to for support? From what quarter of the country will it receive the encouraging words: "Well done, good and faithful servant?" From what part of the laboring and producing masses of our people would it appeal to as the conservator and guardian of their interests?

But more aptly the question may be asked: What part of our land has it selected for its final resting place? Is it ready to join the bleeding cohorts and discomfited knights of the Force Bill?

R. P. Bland.

II.—A WARNING TO SAVINGS BANK DEPOSITORS.

BY JOHN HARSEN RHOADES, PRESIDENT OF THE GREENWICH SAVINGS BANK, NEW YORK.

"To be forewarned is to be forearmed," and it may be well, at a time when the question of the ability of the Government to maintain, under existing laws, a parity between gold and silver is being freely discussed in financial circles, and grave fear is entertained that as a result of the continued large monthly purchases of silver bullion the day is not far distant when we must face a premium on gold, to consider what effect this parting in value from the existing ratio between gold and silver will have

upon the savings banks throughout the country, and upon depositors themselves, who number in this State alone one million and a half, and in the aggregate throughout the country at least four millions of population, with deposits amounting to over seventeen hundred millions of dollars.

Savings Banks (certainly in the Eastern and Middle States) are purely benevolent in their character, having no capital and issuing no stock, and are managed by Trustees, who give their time and judgment gratuitously to the work on behalf of the best interests of the people at large. In charge, therefore, of a great and beneficent trust, with all the moral responsibility which properly attaches itself to their work, when it is considered that the moneys deposited are the property and to a large extent constitute the hard-earned savings of the laboring classes, these Trustees are bound to exercise at all times great caution. Their management must be thoroughly conservative in its character, and no personal motive should sway their judgment or control their action. What, then, are the issues which, under the existence of a premium on gold, they are called upon to meet?

As a rule these banks are under close State supervision and governed by well-regulated general laws restricting investments to those which offer the greatest security to the depositor, in addition to which they are in possession of strong reserves in surplus earnings created through the operation of the laws which govern their management. In consequence of this there are no depositories in the country for the savings of the masses in which the risk of loss has been reduced to so low a minimum; but the class of people for whom the banks for savings are intended are often ignorant, easily alarmed, and when alarmed become panic-stricken, and there is danger that with a premium on gold there will come to the depositor a sense of loss upon his savings. Knowing neither the "why nor the wherefore" he will, in the excitement of the hour, seek to obtain possession of his deposits in the expectation that he can thus avert a loss. The deposits, once obtained, are generally unwisely expended or invested in doubtful securities; while if allowed to remain until the era of inflation is over and the premium on gold has disappeared, they could be returned to him in a currency fully equal to if not superior to that in which the deposit was originally made. The known strength of the

institutions themselves, coupled with a prompt strengthening of cash reserves, and every effort made to allay excitement, will in all probability prevent disastrous consequences ; but the danger exists, and shows one phase of the tremendous shock to credit which the mad race for unrestricted coinage now in progress will produce, unless stopped in time.

In this State alone savings banks have two hundred and sixty millions of dollars loaned upon real estate, known as bond and mortgage loans. There are but few of these mortgages so held which contain an agreement to pay the principal in gold or its equivalent when payment is demanded, after becoming due and payable. What, then, is the duty of those who manage these institutions ? Shall these mortgages when past due be called in for payment, or a "gold clause" insisted upon as a measure of precaution both in reference to those held as well as to future investments in this class of property ? If so, then a serious derangement in the rates of interest paid, and, to a certain extent, in the value of real estate itself must ensue, and on no class of the community would this derangement fall heavier than upon the farmer, who, at best, finds it difficult to secure permanent loans upon his property.

Whatever rule is adopted by other leading financial institutions in the country will, in all probability, be followed by the savings banks, and the extent of the precaution, if exercised, will be determined by the exigencies of the occasion as they may arise ; but the question is a serious one and on its decision rests the welfare of a large number of that *debtor class for whose financial aid free coinage is invoked.*

Among the assets of the banks probably more than three hundred millions are invested in securities which contain no provision requiring the principal when due to be paid in gold coin ; and in reference to these, and especially those maturing at an early date, a decline in market value must necessarily ensue, greater or less, as the date of maturity is close at hand or in a somewhat distant future. But the surplus earnings now held by the banks are far more than sufficient to meet any possible decline in values which may arise in the direction named ; while as to future investments, the demand for what is termed "gold loans" and the lower rate of interest obtainable thereby, would undoubtedly induce municipalities and corporations to embody such an agreement in all future loans offered to the public.

But beyond all these questions which affect the assets of the banks, there is another question far more serious in its character, and that is: How will the depositor himself be affected through a premium on gold? Deposits are received and must be paid in the currency of the country, whatever the circulating medium may be at the time of payment. The amounts withdrawn annually from the banks in this State aggregate one-third of the entire sum on deposit, or an average total of one hundred and ninety millions of dollars; and this percentage, or at least one-fourth, may be set down as the rule when applied to the country at large.

The experience of the past has proved beyond question that the existence of a currency not on a par with gold produces inflation in the values of all property, both real and personal—the greater or less as the breach widens or narrows between the two, and accelerated if the separation is coupled with continued new issues of that which is of a lesser value.

In the presence of these facts the depositor, whose only property is generally the savings which from year to year out of small earnings he has laid by for future need, will find himself compelled, as from time to time he withdraws his deposits, to receive in payment therefor a currency, the purchasing power of which is steadily decreasing as the premium on gold increases. In other words, which practically means the same thing, his rent, clothing, furniture and food, which go to make up nearly all the necessaries of life, will cost him more, though subject to those fluctuations in value which arise from short supply, over-production and improved methods of production, for the reason that under all conditions he will be compelled to purchase at *currency prices* which must be in excess of those obtainable in *gold coin*, while during the progress of inflation, his wages already high will not advance in anything like the same proportion as do those necessaries of life which are needed for his support. The result of this will be that his ability to save will lessen until it has ceased entirely, while the burden of support will rest a heavier load than ever upon his shoulders.

And if this be true while inflation progresses, what must the result be when the time comes—*and come it will*—when the fever has exhausted itself and returning reason leads back to a sound and stable currency? Then with declining values and a de-

pressed condition of trade he will find himself once more the victim of circumstances and for the time being be compelled to accept reduced compensation and irregular periods of employment. As all wealth springs from the soil, so do all fluctuations in value pulsate back to the source from which they came, and "he who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow" while through conditions of general prosperity or increased returns for his labor, shares in the gains, is both unprepared and powerless to protect himself from losses when they come, and which, with resistless force, bear him to the ground.

As a nation we are great and strong, rich and prosperous, fertile in resources and patriotic to the core. We can and do stand much bad legislation, and rally quickly when stricken down; but the poison of inflation is in our blood, doing its deadly work, and nothing remains for us but to hope and believe that the "common sense" of the American people, which is at once our glory and our pride, will make its voice heard and heeded in the counsels of the nation before it is too late, and we are forced to learn, through bitter experience and at material loss, the lesson which history can teach, but to which we seemingly give no heed.

JOHN HARSEN RHOADES.

III.—A DEPOSITOR'S POINT OF VIEW.

BY A DEPOSITOR IN A SAVINGS BANK.

I AM a clerk in a store up town earning $25 a week. I have a wife and two children and I have just $1,500 saved up. The way I became possessed of all this money was as follows: Whatever my salary was I put one-quarter of it away each week in the savings bank, and then my wife and myself scratched around and tried to save as much out of the balance as we could.

Now the day our savings should reach the sum I have mentioned, we had resolved to commemorate the event in a becoming manner, so we ordered a nice little dinner at a restaurant around the corner from where we lived, and took seats for the play afterwards.

I think it was the Egyptians who invariably had a death's head introduced at their feasts to prevent their becoming too happy. Alas, we didn't need one at ours, as matters turned out. While we were in the middle of our entertainment we became attracted by a discussion between two gentlemen seated at the nearest table. They were evidently just finishing their meal, and when they rose to go one of them emphatically gave utterance to the following remark: "I don't know what other effect it will have," he said, "but I tell you this, if the Sherman act is not repealed very quickly there isn't a bank in the country that's safe." Now I vaguely knew that the Sherman act was connected with the silver question, but the silver question had heretofore had no more interest for me than the diamond question of South Africa might have. If the silver question could affect the banks, however, or more particularly the savings banks, it brought matters home to me.

All through the remainder of our meal the man's remark kept ringing in my ears. It sounded as a distinct note of warning and quite cast a damper on our anticipated pleasure at the play. Please don't laugh at our anxiety, but any reflection that our $1,500 was unsafe after we had it in the bank was not a pleasant one. God knows we had deprived ourselves of enough to lay by that money; we had pinched and saved and scrimped and, after all, it was only that we should have provision against a rainy day. Nevertheless, we filled out the programme for the evening, though it was in a somewhat perfunctory manner, resolving that we would leave till the morrow an investigation of the chance words we had heard.

The next day after business hours I asked for an interview with the head of the firm where I was employed, and by way of preliminary had a talk with him on the subject of the silver question generally.

The gist of his opinion was that if the government did not repeal the Sherman act, or issue bonds to counteract the flow of gold out of the country, too little gold would remain; gold would then rise to a premium and we would slide on to a silver basis before we knew it. He thought, however, the banks were prepared for the emergency. Thus I did not seem to have much cause for alarm; my salary was pretty sure, and if the banks did not fail my money also was secure. All the same, however, I

thought I would go over and talk with the president of the bank where I had my savings. I was received very politely; not at all in the toploftical way I had anticipated. He reiterated what the head of my firm had told me. "Even if gold should go to a premium," he said, "we are prepared, and I do not anticipate that there would be any monetary stringency during the transition."

"How high, sir," I asked, "do you think gold would go if it did rise to a premium?"

"Well, it might go, and probably would go, to a point that would mark the difference between the actual value of gold and silver."

"What is that difference?"

"Well, a silver dollar could be produced now, I think, if the truth were known, for about thirty-three cents in gold; therefore, gold might go to a premium of about three hundred per cent."

"Well, now, Mr. President," I asked, "how about the money I've got in bank? Suppose gold had gone to such a premium and I wished to draw out the money, would I get paid my fifteen hundred dollars in gold?"

He smiled. "I hardly think that would be possible," he said.

It came upon me like a flash. I would get my fifteen hundred dollars in silver, or in a currency worth two-thirds less than I had put in. In other words, I had put fifteen hundred dollars in the bank, and would take out a sum, measured by the same standard of value as my deposit, equivalent to about five hundred dollars only.

"Give me my money right away," said I, "I'll withdraw it before gold does rise to a premium."

"What will you do with it?" said he.

"Aren't there gold bonds or mortgages paid in gold—that I could invest it in?" I asked.

"Certainly," he replied, "but if you bought these, and gold rose to the point I mentioned, it is probable, or say possible, few companies could meet the strain and pay either interest or principal in anything else than legal tender. So you would be no better off, or at most have an expensive lawsuit on your hands to compel them to fulfil their obligations.

"What shall I do to be secure, Mr. President?" Then I told him how hard both my wife and myself had struggled to put by

that money; how many deprivations it represented—how many little pleasures had been postponed and given up; that neither parsimony or miserliness had anything to do with its acquisition, but only my health had not been over-good and we recognized the necessity of having something secure against a day when I could no longer attend to my business.

He seemed touched by my story.

"The only absolutely safe plan," he answered, "is to buy gold before it goes to a premium, and we can keep it for you in the vaults here. The sole risk you would run is the loss of interest should gold remain as it is."

"One more question, Mr. President. What do you think are the chances that gold *will* remain as it is?"

"Confidentially, I think they are very slim, unless Congress repeals the Sherman act. The business of the country was never better, but it cannot stand the continuation of the purchase of four millions of silver per month." My mind was made up.

It was certainly a hardship to lose the interest on my money, but I could afford to lose that better than to suffer a big cut in my capital, so I made the exchange and deposited the gold in the vaults.

At last I felt secure, but the anxiety I had gone through awoke my interest in this silver question and the real danger to the community should the Sherman act not be repealed. I thought about it day and night—no longer in my own interest, but in its bearings on others situated like myself, and the more I thought of it the wider seemed to grow the possibilities of evil.

All these people who have put by a little money may one of these days wake up and find, not only their capital, but their interest, cut down by two-thirds the value. Every one who has bought a few shares of stock or a railroad bond may find his interest paid in a commodity worth one-third of what he had counted on receiving. Every one, too, who has been paying a premium on his life in good money may expect his family to find themselves on his death in possession of a policy equal in value to one-third of what they had the right to expect. Every old soldier who draws a pension (there are some who deserve them), every one engaged at a salary in every business, every government employee and the recipient of trust funds, will receive his or her quota,

interest, or salary in a depreciated coin. The more I thought of it the madder I got. It is the poor man's money, say the silver-people. The poor man's money, forsooth! Just think of the satire of it. These silver-kings making obligations to themselves payable in gold, forcing the Government to buy up four millions a month of the output of their mines to sustain the price, and then calling silver the poor man's money! It is the poor man's money in this way: that it is liable to make any one three times poorer than he now is who gets paid in it, and that is all there is about it.

DEPOSITOR IN A SAVINGS BANK.

STAG HUNTING IN DEVON AND SOMERSET.

BY THE RIGHT HON. SUSAN, COUNTESS OF MALMESBURY.

I.

IT WOULD be too much to expect of anyone, not West-Country born or bred, to feel as passionately stirred by this, the finest and most genuine of English sports, as those who from their youth have drunk deep of the exhilarating air which sweeps over the Quantock and Exmoor districts, "the Haunt of the Wild Red Deer." But, considering what hunting with the "Devon and Somerset" actually is, and that in no other part of England is their noble quarry to be found, while neither in Scotland nor in Ireland, where he still exists, is he treated like the gallant gentleman he really is, it is a matter for surprise that the sport should not be more widely known—not that we of the West ardently desire to advertise the matter, for do not the present fields number thousands on foot and horses by fifties instead of the small devoted following of former days? And among these thousands, alas! how many true sportsmen are there to be found? The question is one best left unanswered, but how anyone can condescend to run a fallow buck or a carted deer who could hunt a wild "forester" in his own spacious domain, perhaps for thirty miles, as the crow flies, across the heather light into the Bristol Channel, is more than we of the "West Country" can understand.

Writing as I am for American readers, I wish to begin by making it clearly understood with what part of England we have now to deal, and I cannot help feeling that what seemed to me a large expanse of uncultivated country must to them appear a little spot indeed. Everything, however, is by comparison, and the district where the red deer have harbored free and uncon-

trolled since the Conquest—and before that time—is of great extent when the map of England is considered and the inroads of civilization are taken into account.

Looking at the two counties of Devon and Somerset and drawing a line on the map from Bridgewater to Ilfracombe, thence to Exeter, and from Exeter back again to Bridgewater, you get, according to one of the best authorities,* a rough notion of the country traversed by the deer, although they sometimes stray outside these imaginary bounds or are run further afield by the hounds. This applies to the present state of affairs, since the Quantock country has been regularly hunted and reserved to the deer, but these were originally to be found, practically speaking, all over England; then, by dint of poaching and being killed in various ways and for different reasons, the small remnant of the ancient race of foresters, or wild red deer, retreated to the remote district of the Exe, where they had a certain immunity from attack and where their depredations were of no consequence owing to absence of cultivation.

Exmoor, from the time of the Conquest, was a royal forest, which does not in the least signify a wood, many so-called *forests* being, as in this case, to a great extent bare of trees, but simply a district where the deer enjoy certain rights and protection as royal beasts of the chase, and which they make their habitual resort.

The first authentic record of Exmoor as a royal hunting ground comes to us in the form of a charter, dated May, 1204, by which Devonshire, up to certain given bounds, was freed from the severity of forest law. Ninety years later Edward I. caused a "perambulation" to be made, the results of which are preserved, and by which it would appear that the district extended further north than at present, but the boundaries to the south and west were those of the present division between the two counties. Certain other portions of Exmoor were then disafforested, a concession which meant a great deal in days when it was death or mutilation to kill or injure a royal stag, and when no one within ten miles of forest bounds was allowed to keep a hound which had not been "expedited," that is, the ball of the forefoot cut out to prevent any possibility of his running deer.†

*Richard Jefferies, "The Red Deer."
† These laws were in force in the New Forest of Hampshire.

These and other worse barbarities gradually fell into disuse, or were abrogated as too oppressive, until at last, in the reign of George III., an act of Parliament was passed to permit certain enclosures to be made and constituted the King's private property, giving him power to sell the rest of the land.

The extent of Exmoor Forest proper was then about eighteen hundred acres, of which about ten were made over to Sir Thomas Acland in compensation for his claim of tithe over the whole, and to certain other landholders instead of their ancient forest rights. The whole of this was bought by a Worcestershire gentleman, who endeavored, fortunately with very poor success, although he sank a vast sum of money, to bring the land into cultivation, and to enclose this large tract of barren soil, which produces little but coarse and wiry grass.

Outside this special district and in the whole of the Quantock country the hills, which range up to about thirteen hundred feet in height, are clothed to their tops with heather and the whortleberry, their sides being deeply scored by narrow valleys, wooded up to the point where the stunted tree-tops catch the biting wind, which shaves them off sharply as with a shears. Each of these "coombes," as they are locally called, has a mountain stream running down it, and here the deer come to bathe or soil,* as it is technically called, in the summer, when the heat and flies try them, or to refresh themselves during the chase or after one of their desperate fights. The sides of these coombes are very steep, and are a great test of the endurance of stag, horse, or hound. For this reason short, cobby horses are mostly used, but they must be well bred, as well as stout and sure of foot, else stag and hounds may very well run clean away from them, particularly if it is rather late in the season, and the stag, no longer so fat, is of the light galloping sort we shall presently hear of, or if a hind is being hunted.

From the top of the Quantock range of hills you look out across the Bristol Channel with the Steep and Flat Holmes, Lundy Island, farther south, and across the water Wales is plainly to be seen on a clear day. Behind you lies the fertile valley of Taunton Dean, while south and east stretch the Exmoor and and Dartmoor countries. All through this part of England the forester roams unmolested at his own lordly pleasure, save when hunted at stated times, feeding at will on the daintiest fare, drink-

* From the old French term in venery—*souler*, to wash or soak.

ing none but the sweetest running water, a *gourmet* and an aristocrat, whose pedigree goes back, at any rate, a long way beyond that of any who have tried to prove that he is not indigenous to the soil.

I should mention that the red deer are known as stag, hind, and calf, and not, like their fellow cousins, as buck, doe, and fawn. To be more accurate, the stag is only known as such when he becomes "warrantable," that is, of an age to be run, which is shown by his head, and which he cannot be until five years old. In rare cases he may be thought fit to hunt at the age of four. The horns of the red deer are quite unlike those of any other, and the subject of their growth and condition at different periods is so obscure and so vexed that only an approximate opinion can be expressed, experts being in many cases quite at variance. I will try to state, as clearly and briefly as possible, what, in the West Country, is considered to be the rule, to which, however, there are numerous exceptions.

By the time a deer is five years old he should have what are called his "rights," that is, the *brow antler*, which is nearest the base of the horn or *burr*, the *bez* or *bay*, an inch or two higher up the *beam* or *upright* (main shaft of the horn), the *tray* or *tres* above that, and finally *two on top*, or two points on one of his antlers. This constitutes a stag of light points—a runnable or warrantable deer, who will, in another year, have two on top on both sides and become a stag of ten points. In Scotland when there are three on top on both sides the head is termed a royal one, but I have never heard the term used in the West. Most of these words are derived from old Norman-French hunting terms, but the deer themselves are called by names which sound unmistakably English. In his first year, for instance, a young male deer is a calf, at two years he is a "knobber," "knobbler" or "brochet," from his budding antlers, a hind at the same age being called a "hearst." In the third year, he is a "spire" or "pricket," the upright beam having formed, after which he becomes a "staggart," attaining to his full titles and dignities at the age of five.

The actual condition of the head is subject to a great many variations, some of the points given above being occasionally wanting, but it is safe to say that, save in a case of actual deformity, the brow antlers are always to be found. It is with these that

the stag at bay is able to do most damage, particularly if he can succeed in transfixing his antagonist against a rock, or any hard resisting surface. He will sometimes go right through a hound's body in this way, and inflict grievous wounds on horse or man incautious enough to approach too near him. It is only fair to add that he will never attack a man of his own free will, but in those desperate last moments will always sell his life as dearly as he can.

Another element in the growth of the horns is the fact that, although they are generally born in the month of June, a hunted hind has been known to have a very young calf with her as late as November, so recently born that the hounds were whipped off in consequence. The natural constitution and strength of the animal, his feeding and any accidental injury received, either to the head itself or to any other part of his body, also determines almost as much as his age the state of perfection to which his antlers may have arrived. Up to five years, the age of a deer may be known by his teeth, but this is naturally of no use to the hunter who has first to catch his stag!

After eight years they begin generally to "go back;" their bodies shrink, their antlers become smoother, smaller and less wide spreading, but here again the rule must not be resorted to implicitly, as a certain stag, well known to be at least fourteen years old, had a head of nineteen points. In color, the forester is a reddish brown, shading off into light fawn underneath. The hinds are a duller hue, while their calves are for the first three months of their life dappled like a fawn. Their muzzles are shorter and more pointed than their German relatives. They are altogether lighter and more graceful. That the red deer is a distinct variety is shown by the fact that the calves always come true to their known characteristics, and that they disdain to sully the purity of their ancient race by a mésalliance with either fallow or roe.

The stag is a very dainty, fine gentleman indeed; the best of everything is not too good for him, and the damage he does the neighboring farmers would hardly be believed. He always feeds at night, and in the early morning returns to his bed in a favorite wood. This is technically called his *layer*, and here he lies snug with his head down wind resting for the day. Otherwise he always keeps his nostrils to the wind. In one night he

will do incredible mischief in a field of turnips, which he pulls up by the roots, eating only one bite out of each and tossing the remainder disdainfully over his head. He will go into a field of ripe corn, and, catching three or four ears at a time between his teeth, delicately strip them without tearing them up by the roots, and earlier in the year, when the stalks are green and succulent, three or four stags will, in one night, make a deplorable spectacle of a young crop. At one time, when the numbers of the deer became very much reduced, turnips and corn were purposely planted for them, but since the beginning of the century they have fed as they could.

In spite of their sufferings, the farmers are so devoted to the sport, which indeed could not continue to exist without their forbearance, that one never hears nowadays of a stag being shot or mutilated by them. They are, of course, compensated for their losses, but it is difficult to make good to them the disappointment or annoyance they so cheerfully endure in a sportsmanlike spirit. Scarcely any fence will keep out a stag, who will jump great heights standing, never seeming to choose an easy place, while he is very bold when in search of a favorite dish, and is not to be taken in by any scarecrow or other clumsy device of man.

So far as can be ascertained, the first pack of hounds actually used for stag hunting was kept by Hugh Pollard, the Ranger of Exmoor Forest at Simonsbath in the heart of that country, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, and his successors continued to keep up the sport till the end of the seventeenth century, after which time the history of the pack becomes that of the old Devonshire families of the neighborhood, passing from one to another. Sir Thomas Acland hunted the country at his own expense for fifty years and was succeeded in 1770 by his son, a second Sir Thomas.

There is a curious letter still existing at Exeter dated from Dulverton in 1769, written by one of the park-keepers of "Courteney Walrond" to a sporting barber in the town. This epistle gives a very good picture of the manners of the time, although it is exceedingly strange that a man in that class should have been able to write at all, for even great ladies of that date, with a name in history, were some of them scarce able to do so, while their spelling of one and the same word looks as variable as the skies under which they first saw the light. The letter in question is reproduced at full length in Capt. Fortescue's book on Stag-

Hunting, and gives a graphic account of how the first-named gentleman, accompanied by several friends and servants started at two o'clock, one September morning, and did not reach the place where they were to meet Sir Thomas and his beauties till ten—a goodly time to spend in riding twenty miles. They dined early in those days, so that, although they sat for several hours afterwards drinking deep, they may yet have been fairly sober by the time they started.

We shall never know in what reposeful ditch or half-way house these morning hours were spent, but later on we hear that "Master" and his friends "rode exceeding bold," while from the reputation of Sir Thomas for hospitality—a fame undimmed by the passage of a century, it is only too probable that these gentlemen were but (as the writer too rashly avers) "in very good order" when they went to bed, since we learned that they all dined at Pixton* and drank "several proper healths." I cannot help fancying that Sir Thomas's claret and port were like himself—sound, generous and much appreciated.

I should here mention the horrible custom, which prevailed for many years, and which would certainly not strengthen our degenerate nerves, weakened by jorums of tea, or give us an appetite for dinner—the ceremony of drinking the stag's health. This was done when the huntsman brought in the head at supper, and after sounding the "mort," opened the stag's mouth and fixing a quart glass of claret or port between the jaws, handed round the ghastly goblet that everyone present might honor the toast.

The staghounds of these days were very different from the present pack. They were tall, heavy and slow; they had a good deal of the bloodhound in them, with the solemn face and long drooping ears of that race, and were apt to be very much punished by a long day after what Lord Graves, who was master at the end of last century, describes as a "light galloping stag," and which he specially recommends his successor to avoid on account of the havoc their terrific pace made with both horses and hounds, which were sometimes not fit to come out again for a fortnight. Nowadays, however, the "Devon and Somerset" are a very different breed and are recruited from almost every pack in the kingdom, most of them being simply over-sized foxhounds, drafted out of their original kennels for that reason. They get through the heather

*Sir Thomas Acland's country-house—headquarters of the pack.

much more easily, their pace and endurance is greater, their feet less tender, and when properly handled at first and entered to deer there is little difficulty with them—except in the matter of sheep. Yes, I blush to relate it, but this is a true history, naught being extenuated and naught being set down in malice. The stanchest hound will sometimes cover himself with obloquy, forsaking the path of fame and virtue to kill a sheep.

Let me hasten to draw a veil over this damaging admission, merely putting forward as an extenuating circumstance that there is said to be a great similarity of scent between the little half-wild Exmoor sheep and the red deer, while Exmoor mutton is to my certain knowledge more like venison in flavor than anything else. There is also this to be said, that there is no end to the wiles of a hunted deer, and that when he throws himself among a flock of sheep it is very confusing to the hounds, who are, moreover, famished and exhausted perhaps with a long run.

To return to the history of the pack. Sir Thomas Acland was succeeded by his son of the same name, who kept up the family traditions of magnificence and hospitality, and who was still hunting the country ten years later. Of him it is recorded that when compelled to sleep out after an extra long run he chose out some member of the hunt to share his bed, accommodation being probably limited. The quality he always looked for in such a companion was that he did not snore. What would happen if a man inadvertently snored, I cannot tell, for Sir Thomas was a masterful man. Deer in those days were far more plentiful than they afterwards became, when they were simply destroyed out of revenge in consequence of feuds between the great county families, and perhaps for reasons which have not been handed down, besides being barbarously murdered by poachers. The pack then passed from the Acland family (who could ride for thirty miles across their own land) to the Bassetts and Fortescues; then to Lord Graves, in whose day there were two hundred deer in the country—a hundred short of the palmy days of the two Sir Thomases. Finally in 1825, after certain fat years of prosperity under the Fortescues, succeeded by very lean years indeed, when the sport dwindled down to almost nothing, the original pack was sold. This was the end of the last representatives of the true staghound in England. No doubt with them departed to a certain extent the race of sportsmen, who came out not to have a

gallop, but to watch the working of the hounds and to study and enjoy the habits of a noble wild creature in his native home, driven to use every resource given him by nature against the instinct of his four-footed and the trained intelligence of his human persecutors.

For thirty years the red deer became the prey of poachers and deer-stealers; they were left no rest and were nearly being exterminated. Various masters tried their hands at the ancient sport, but for the most part with poor success. Harriers even had their day, and it seemed as if the last remnant of the natural lords of the forest would before long be cut off from the land of the living. Finally, in the year 1855, Mr. Fenwick Brisett started afresh with a pack of foxhounds from Cornwall, and under his able and public-spirited mastership stag-hunting prospered, deer were preserved, and the country was regularly and successfully hunted for twenty-seven years.

SUSAN MALMESBURY.

GOVERNMENT AID TO THE NICARAGUA CANAL.

BY SENATOR JOHN T. MORGAN, OF ALABAMA.

In the testimony of Count Ferdinand de Lesseps, given before the Select Committee of the House of Representatives, March 8, 1880 (Mis. Doc. No. 16, 44th Congress, 3d Session), he said: "There were fourteen projects of canals presented at the Paris Congress, but the interest had entirely centred in the Nicaragua and Panama routes. . . . If it were determined to build a lock canal, and if there could not be a canal between the two oceans, except a lock canal, then there was no doubt that the Nicaragua route was the best route."

The Panama Canal Company, after years of exhaustive effort, and the expenditure of immense sums of money of the French people, the loss of which even threatens the republic, has demonstrated the fact that no other than a lock canal can be built and maintained across the Isthmus of Darien at any cost that the commerce of the world would be able to bear, as the basis of toll charges.

The abandonment of the effort to change the plan of the Panama Canal from a sea-level waterway to a canal with locks (for the amount of water at the highest level has settled that problem as being beyond the reach of successful solution) has verified the assurances of Mr. Menocal and Admiral Ammen, given to the Congress at Paris, that the work was impracticable.

If the canal was built with locks and if it could be supplied with water by steam pumping, according to the last desperate alternative suggested by the company's engineers when the sea-level plan was abandoned, the future use of the canal would be embarrassed with the other insurmountable difficulties thus

graphically presented by Mr. Eades in his testimony before the House Select Committee, on the same hearing (Mis. Doc. 10). Mr. Eades says :

"Anyone who contemplates the depth of the proposed cut through the several miles of the Cordilleras, and thinks of the frightful rains and tempests which prevail during six months of the year, can form some faint conception, perhaps, of the amount of material which would be washed down the side of this immense cut, as well as from all other parts of the canal and which must be continually dredged out of it to preserve its usefulness.

Other statements equally worthy of credit show that no work in that locality could be maintained against the destructive floods which would suddenly rush through, what Mr. Eades describes as, "the narrow and tortuous stream which Count de Lesseps proposes to locate at the bottom of an artificial cañon to be cut through the Cordilleras at Panama."

These facts, and the opinions of many great engineers, eliminate all other canal projects from the necessity of further discussion, and leave us to consider alone the political and financial questions presented in the project of the Nicaraguan Canal, under the present concessions from Nicaragua and Costa Rica.

Those concessions are grants of rights, privileges and property to individuals, and through them to a corporation chartered in the United States. They have been complied with by that corporation, as to all the preliminary conditions, and have been confirmed as permanent grants by the governments of Nicaragua and Costa Rica.

In making these exclusive concessions these governments announce to the world a plan for the change of geographical conditions, in which all civilized nations have an interest, and, accordingly, they have so planned the canal and regulated its control as to give equal advantages without discrimination to the ships and commerce of all nations.

In this sense the concessions were a political covenant with mankind and, in this sense, it is obvious that "government aid" has, so far, supplied every element of the progress of the work. The canal is the creature, alone, of "government aid." Without discussing the right of every maritime power, other than the United States, to claim that these concessions confer upon them privileges that they may insist shall not be withdrawn, to their detriment, it is clear that the concessions distinctly relate to the political right of the United States to have an influential part

in the project of changing the geography of the Western Hemisphere. It is provided in the concessions that "a company of execution" shall be formed, having its place of business in New York. A great corporation was contemplated which should own the concessions granted to American citizens, and that it should be subject to the laws of organization, control and administration to be enacted in the United States and enforced by like authority. All governments, and through them their people, are invited to become stockholders in the company styled in the concessions "The Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua."

Nicaragua and Costa Rica are stockholders in the company and may vote for directors, and, through them, take part in all the doings of the directors. They are bound thereby to the full extent that is included in the grants and limitations of the concessions, as completely as the other stockholders are bound. They provide expressly for the ownership of stock in the canal company by other governments,—giving a preference to other American States in the right to subscribe for the stock. The corporation, therefore, is not only to be a public corporation, but international, and is to have governments, as its stockholders, that are to vote in the direction of the affairs of the company, including the governments that made the grants.

This is, necessarily, a very peculiar political situation, in connection with a geographical situation and its attendant necessities, that exists nowhere else in the world. It presents opportunities, rights and duties to the consideration and determination of the United States that are universally recognized as entitling us to a powerful, if not a dominant, influence in everything relating to the canal and its uses. The duties thus resting with us are well defined in the message of President Hayes when he said that "this must be an American canal, under American control."

The concessions made by Nicaragua and Costa Rica are in line with this declaration, and make it even more specific by the opportunity given to the United States to build the canal and make it subject to our control. When this new attitude had been sedately taken by those governments and was formulated in concessions to citizens of the United States—not less solemn, or obligatory, than formal treaties—Congress met the overture by granting a charter to "The Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua,"

to be the "company of execution" provided for in the concession. Here was the concurrent "aid" of three governments to the canal. These three republics lent their sovereign powers in aid of this benefaction to mankind, without considering the question of its cost, or its value as an investment, and without the least thought that they could help a few favorites to grow rich; or the least apprehension that, while they were all looking on at the dealings of the company of execution, and were represented in the company, any fraud or corruption could scandalize their great and patriotic work.

Congress accepted these concessions as the basis of its action, as was contemplated in their provisions, and conformed its legislation to the pledges of good faith towards our citizens in securing them the enjoyment and protection of their rights and privileges therein granted.

This was governmental control over the canal in accordance with the concessions, and Congress reserved the right to alter, amend, or repeal the charter, according to its pleasure. Congress also required the president and secretary of the canal company to make reports, under oath, from time to time, to the Secretary of the Interior, "giving such detailed statement of its officers and of its assets and liabilities as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, and any wilfully false statement so made shall be deemed perjury and punishable as such." Congress fixed the number of directors of the canal company and the manner of their election, the amount of the capital stock to be issued, and required that a majority of the Board of Directors shall be citizens and residents of the United States.

In these and other provisions of the charter, quite as important, Congress exercised legislative jurisdiction and political power over the corporation as full and complete as if this had been a domestic corporation. This, also, was "government aid" to the canal, strictly responsive to the action taken by Costa Rica and Nicaragua. It was aid without which the canal would not have been built or controlled by American citizens.

After Congress had taken this line of action and had thus created international obligations with two sister republics, and had assumed the duty of framing laws for creating and controlling "the company of execution," provided for in these concessions, for the benefit of all commercial countries, we had

thereby established very intimate governmental relations with this canal and its public and private promoters.

So intimate are these relations and so necessary to the preservation of the commerce, business interests and the social and political communication of our Eastern and Western States and people, and to the practical continuity of our coast line, and the safety of our country, that we may say that the United States has adopted the Nicaragua Canal as an instrumentality of government ; not a means of governing Nicaragua and Costa Rica, or any foreign people, or power, but as a means necessary to the better government of our own country.

To us, this canal is as much a means of government, as it is to those republics ; its distance from our possessions being the only real difference. It equally removes the barrier to water communication between the two oceans, for the benefit of each of the three republics, which is measured by twice the length of South America, and which is made extremely perilous by the dangerous navigation of the cold and turbulent seas of the Antarctic regions.

Following this result, this canal opens an easy and short route for the transit of the mails, for the passage of troops, and of ships of war and of commerce, and lessens the cost of naval armaments to all American States by about one-half. In the interest of the peace of the world, this is a blessing of incalculable value. There is no light in which this project can be viewed that does not disclose the practical necessity of this canal as an instrument of better government and a facility of actual government to the people, States and Federal Government of the United States.

No nation has the right, in view of the concessions made by Nicaragua and Costa Rica to our citizens, and of our legislation to aid and perfect those rights, to say to us that we shall not proceed to aid the canal by a subvention, or in any other way that is consistent with the sovereignty of Nicaragua and Costa Rica over their own domain.

Any other nation may as well demand of us the repeal of the charter granted by Congress to the canal company, as to say that we shall not make that legislation effectual by giving material aid to the building of the canal, and secure our government against loss. The Clayton-Bulwer treaty, our treaty with Nicaragua, concluded Aug. 21, 1867, and her treaty of Feb. 11, 1860, with

Great Britain, upon which our treaty was modelled, all look to and provide for this canal and for material aid to it. They only exclude the right of either power from acquiring sovereign rights in Nicaragua. If British subjects now held the concessions that are owned by our people, and if Parliament should charter a "company of execution," and grant it a subsidy or any form of aid, we should have nothing to interpose, in the way of logical argument, to prevent the British Empire from dominating the canal to the extent of every power, right and privilege included in these concessions. Nicaragua and Costa Rica could not present an argument, or a plausible protest, against such dominion by Great Britain, and we could only interpose an argument upon the Monroe Doctrine, as it was emasculated by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, if we stood simply on our treaty relations for the measure of our rights.

But we are solemnly warned and assured by the convictions of every American heart that it would be dangerous, unpatriotic and cowardly in us to admit any trans-Atlantic power to usurp the place we naturally occupy towards that route of transit between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. We have a duty in this matter, laid upon us by the hand of Providence, which we cannot evade, and a power to execute that command, which we cannot surrender, that compel us to take a decisive part in this greatest work laid out for human hands to complete. If our internal policy is not such as to make us the least and most impotent of all the great powers, and to fetter our hands when we would stretch them forth to enlarge our commerce, increase our mail facilities, lower the shipping charges upon our productions, increase our population and their industries, and send out fleets to protect our coasts and secure respect for our flag, there is no question as to our power and duty to aid in the construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

As to getting closer to the subject and exerting sovereign dominion over the canal in the country where it is located, which some enemies of the canal insist that we should do, the answer is that we would add nothing to our proper influence over the canal by this means, and, in doing this by force, we should dishonor ourselves in the esteem of sister republics that have always trusted the honor and integrity of the United States. Then, recent history would condemn us in the eyes of all

nations, for, when Nicaragua tendered to us almost the full measure of sovereignty over the territory occupied by the canal, we seemed to shrink from that opportunity, as the ghost of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty seemed to rise from its forgotten grave to warn us of danger. After that, it ill becomes us to say that we will have no canal unless we shall first have *usurped* the sovereignty over Nicaragua and Costa Rica.

The Suez Canal, with almost a hundred miles of continuous digging, cost about $100,000,000; of this sum $30,000,000 was wasted in interest, commissions, changes of location, and bad management. That canal has now a traffic of nearly 9,000,000 tons annually, and it must be speedily enlarged to accommodate the commerce that is crowding through it to the western coast of the Pacific Ocean. The Nicaragua Canal has 29½ miles of canal prism, or axial, line. Of this one-third is very light dredging. The total length of this transit, from sea to sea, is 169½ miles; of this line, 155¼ miles is slack water navigation at an elevation of 110 feet above the level of the sea.

This small lift is overcome by six locks—three on either side of the lake. The entire cost of the canal ready for use, as estimated by Mr. Menocal, allowing 25 per cent. for contingencies, is $65,084,176. A board of five other great engineers went over Mr. Menocal's measurements and estimates with great care, and out of abundant caution, and not because of any substantial change in his figures, they added to his estimates another 20 per cent. for contingencies, and so changed his estimate as to make the total cost of the canal ready for service, $87,799,570. It seems that this may be reasonably accepted as the outside possible cost of the canal.

But, if we run up the conjectural cost to $100,000,000, the canal, if built for that sum, must be the most valuable property in the world, of its magnitude. The tonnage, annually, can scarcely fall below that of the Suez Canal. It will gradually exceed that amount. If it is two-thirds as great as that which passes through the St. Mary's Canal on the lakes it will equal 9,000,000 tons. Who does not know that it must be greater than the traffic supplied by so small an area of inland country?

A just estimate would be fixed, confidently, by the most careful and hesitating persons at 9,000,000 tons per annum, to say nothing of income from passengers, of whom swarms will emi-

grate to the Pacific coast. On this estimate we could place the tolls at the rate of one dollar per ton, and realize $9,000,000 per annum. Take $3,000,000 of this sum for maintenance of the canal, which will not exceed half that sum ; $3,000,000 for interest on the bonded debt, and $3,000,000 for the stockholders, and we will have a result that should excite the cupidity of the most grasping speculator. But the true friend of the industrial and commercial people will see in this result a saving to industry and commerce of more than one-half the charges for tonnage that are now paid to the Suez Canal.

If the United States is the owner of 80,000,000 of the 100,000,000 of the stock in this canal, and if it is to cost $100,000,000 to build it, the dividends on that 80,000,000 of stock, employed in a sinking fund and invested in the bonds of the company, would pay the entire cost of construction and the interest on the bonds in less than fifty years.

These are some of the indisputable facts that show that it is a good financial operation, and a duty that concerns the honor, welfare and security of the United States. It is a project worthy to be accomplished as the closing splendor of the nineteenth century. Above all, it will stand as an example to mankind to prove that the great Republic of republics is the best form of political government for securing the welfare of the citizen and the fruits of his liberties. It will, indeed, be the crowning glory of this era that the Nicaragua Canal should be built by the aid, and controlled by the influence, of the United States.

The people who have money will build this canal, if no government takes it in hand. But some other government besides Nicaragua or Costa Rica will build and control it. The people of Europe built the Suez Canal when the profits of such an investment were vaguely conjectural. The French people poured hundreds of millions of francs into the Panama Canal scheme, and would repeat the investment if they had a hope of success. If their money had been honestly expended on the present line of the Nicaragua Canal, it would now be in operation, and we would be vainly endeavoring to get our rights there, as we are now doing with reference to the American railroad at Panama. The people will build this canal if some government does not build it, and they will not be American

people. It will cost the canal company $250,000,000 to raise the money to build the canal, and our coastwise and foreign commerce will be taxed on that basis for its use. If we submit to that exaction, without causing a trouble that would spread through the world, it will be a new and dark chapter in our history. The just, wise and safe policy is to prevent such a disaster; to turn aside the temptation to careless indifference, and to prevent danger rather than to take the chances of finding a rough road to our future destiny.

A government that has given far more than $100,000,000 to build trans-continental railroads should not fear to invest money, on an assured basis of profit, in order to give some of the advantages of fair competition in transportation charges to the great body of the industrial classes. Unpleasant scandals did attend the use of the money raised on the credit of the government, in the building of one of these railroads, but corruption was made possible by the absence of governmental control in the Board of Directors. A repetition of that wrong has become impossible. Two of these railroads now owe us more than $100,000,000, and they can and must pay the debt. That money, when it falls into the Treasury, will more than replace all that we will expend in building the Nicaragua Canal, if we should sink every dollar of it. It has done a great work for the people of America and of the world — a work for which we would not be willing to take any conceivable sum of money. Those railroads are our pride, as a people. They are essential parts of our civilization and indispensable factors in our government; but they are becoming too much a burden upon our internal and external commerce. Water transportation through the Isthmus of Darien is to be the efficient and just competitor for trans-continental traffic, and will add immensely to their income, at lower rates of transportation, by the rapid increase of population on the Pacific slope. As we have aided great corporations by building railroads for them, let us now aid the people by building a canal that will make freights cheaper and will enrich the common treasury. If we will, we can use the money due us from the railroads to build the canal.

JOHN T. MORGAN.

SHALL OUR LAWS BE CODIFIED?

BY FREDERIC R. COUDERT.

Sir Edward Coke is said to have been a man of very bad temper and disagreeable manners. His own wife was unable to live with him and left him because of his harsh and overbearing methods; but she has been leniently dealt with because her and his contemporaries concurred in her judgment as to the undesirability of constant companionship with so surly and unpleasant a person. But he was, nevertheless, a very great lawyer, the pillar of English jurisprudence, the foremost man of the Bar, a patriot to whom, according to Lord Campbell, the English-speaking people are mainly indebted for the liberty they now enjoy.

The opinion of such a man on any question that involves the subversion of the old system of English jurisprudence must necessarily be of priceless value. If he could be summoned from the grave and made to testify upon such a subject, he would be listened to with the reverence due to a sage, the confidence due to a proved expert, the submission due to a master. As there is no process known for compelling his attendance, we must perforce look into the monuments of learning that he has left behind him and seek to gather from them the testimony which his silent lips may no longer furnish. A very short search will satisfy us that he would have regarded with abhorrence the attempt to imprison the common law in a dungeon of epigrams and to substitute treacherous and insufficient words for living principles. The justification for this invocation of a great lawyer's authority may be found in brief expressions which aptly condense and illustrate two great and fatal objections to codification of the English common law. "I never knew but one or two questions of common law to puzzle the judges," and again, "If I am asked a question of common law I should be ashamed if I could not immediately answer it; but if I am asked a question of statute law, I should be ashamed to answer it without referring to the statute book."

Here we have in distinct and emphatic language, a striking

condemnation of codification. If the written law alone puzzles the judges and the confusion and uncertainty complained of arise mainly from statutes, to what extent will the evil be multiplied, when the old landmarks are swept away and only codes are left to guide the Courts in the administration of justice? And what shall become of our Bar and the litigants, when the lawyers may no longer rely upon their knowledge of principles and rules, based on experience and consecrated by time, but must either rely upon an imperfect memory of statutory verbiage or turn to a compilation, which, at best, is likely to confuse, mislead and vex the student until it has been passed upon and settled by the courts. When it has reached that point, assuming that it ever does, it would indeed require a wise man to tell what has been gained. In either case we must return to judicial interpretation. In the old system that adjudication turns upon principles, in the new one it turns upon words. The lexicon would play a more important part under the latter regime than the former, but what advantage there would be in this it is difficult to see.

The objection to statutes urged by Coke is as strong to-day as it ever was. There is scarcely a judge upon the bench of our higher courts who will not echo his complaint. There is none who will admit that he is not himself familiar with the principles of the common law in their application to the daily concerns of mankind. There is none who has not often labored to extricate meaning, sense or logic from a statute. The volumes of reports prove the truth of this with pathetic but unmistakable reiteration, and rise up in endless succession to warn rash innovators of the peril which they recklessly invoke. The history of the Statute of Frauds alone is eloquent to dissuade men from over-readiness to rely upon statutes. It has been the subject of dissection and investigation in England and America, by the sharpest surgical instruments of both countries, for the last two hundred years, and yet the experience of each day shows that ts capacity for mischief is not exhausted.

It may not be denied that there is about the theory of codification an element of almost irresistible attraction. The thought of formulating the whole body of the law into a brief and perspicuous sentence and of placing it within the easy reach of all except the absolutely illiterate, is well calculated to enlist the

sympathy of a generous mind. From that to "hanging all the lawyers" there is but one short step in the way of social improvement. If every man is bound to know the law, why not put it into such a form that the obligation may not be ludicrously impossible of performance? The rule is now ironical and cruel at the same time; why not so express the law that any searcher may find it with inexperienced thumb, while he waits for his dinner? Bacon wrote many fine things in these brief but frequently recurring periods. Why should not the humblest artisan ascertain for himself his rights, duties, and obligations, to his State, to his family, and to his fellow-citizens? It would, indeed, be very beautiful—so would the millenium. The stern lessons of experience put their veto on well-meaning projects of this character. Where has a code ever produced these results? Where has any system compatible with freedom been devised to make the lawyer's existence unnecessary? The Bar flourishes, with or without codes, and will flourish so long as Law decides the controversies between men, so long as society does not recognize Force as its chief motor and saving principle.

It may, perhaps, be insisted that there are instances of actual and successful codification that prove, by their very existence and the benefits they have conferred, the futility of objections based upon mere theory. The most eminent of the now living advocates of codification produces in evidence the Ten Commandments and the Constitution of the United States; others are content to point out the Code Napoleon and the German Code as illustrations of the claim that the law may be simplified and improved by condensation into one volume. These assertions are entitled to considerate examination. Experience is, after all, the best teacher and, when it may justly claim success as its ally, needs no reinforcements. Is it true, then, that the history of the past shows us that we may, and how we may, codify our common law?

As to the Decalogue and its effect, as an instance of successful codification, it is not easy to speak without the risk of apparent irreverence. If, as the great mass of God-fearing men believe, the Commandments were proclaimed by a Divine authority the illustration is simply irrelevant. Nothing is impossible to Omnipotence. It is plain that an omniscient and all-powerful Being is not confined by our limitations. No one denies that an admirable scheme of law might be proclaimed and estab-

lished by inspired prophets. If scepticism, however, should suggest its doubts as to the literal truth of the Divine origin attributed to the Commandments, it might still be argued that the case is not in point. The force and beauty of the Decalogue lie mainly in the fact that it is supposed to emanate from the Divine power. Strip it of its superhuman origin and test it by ordinary rules and you will find a series of prohibitions against wrongdoing, a catalogue of negative precepts that commend themselves to the general sense of civilized mankind, but which can hardly, by their generality, be used as a model for a merely human code. And even then, it might be added, that tomes ponderous and many have been written, as commentaries, by wise and good men to show that it is not always unlawful to kill or to steal, as those words are generally understood.

The Constitution of the United States, on the other hand, may not be likened to a Code of Laws. Our Constitution was and is but a treaty between several sovereign States forbidding many things which the general Government, created by that instrument, would have otherwise been very likely to do. Its adoption was the culmination and crown of a series of successive acts. The first in point of time and importance was the Declaration of Independence; the next the "Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union Between the States," whereby they severally entered into "a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defence, the security of their liberties and their mutual and general welfare." Finally, the Constitution was created "to form a *more perfect union,* establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare," etc. As a treaty intended to regulate the relations of sovereign States, it is plain that its provisions must be reduced to writing, and the most cursory examination will show that the predominant idea was to concede as little as might be consistent with the general purpose above named, to retain all that might be retained without danger to the common advantage, and to leave no door open to invasion, by the general authority, of the reserved rights of the States. Such an instrument can only be likened to a municipal code by a total disregard of most important differences. It cannot be cited as an instance of successful codification unless we close our eyes to the real and essential character of codification as

we understand the expression, viz., the reduction of an already existing system of law into a written and compact form, while the substance of the ancient jurisprudence is preserved. The Constitution of the United States was a novel experiment; it superseded no established system, it removed nothing that had commanded the allegiance of men before its time. A new condition of things sprang into existence when it received its final seal of approval. From the very nature of the case, the Constitution must be reduced to the form of a written instrument.

But even if we are to consider that our Charter may be likened to a codification of existing laws, might we not point by way of warning to the formidable array of volumes in which our great Justices, beginning with Marshall, have sought to explain the meaning of those concise sentences which the founders so carefully devised. John Marshall, the immortal pioneer in this Herculean task, did much to prevent open rebellion by the masterly exposition which he made of the meaning which should be attached to most happily chosen words. But his successors have been struggling, as he did, to extract sound principles of general application from brief sentences, and we are now governed more by what Marshall, Taney, Storey, and other illustrious men *said* that the Constitution *meant*, than by anything that we can ourselves find in the language itself. If such a Constitution expounded by such men still requires deep judicial meditation and hesitating judgments from our most learned jurists, who will venture to say that a new statute, assuming to supersede a system that has grown venerable with ages of service, and assuming to regulate the most important social, domestic, political, commercial relations of men, will be an unqualified success? May not a great and flourishing State, the Empire State of this continent, where justice is administered at least as satisfactorily as it is in any part of the world, pause before it consents to tear down the old temple, for the purpose of building a new one with untried architects on an untried model, with many chances that it may not be superior to the one now in use?

"But," say the codifiers, "look at France and her splendid Code. Ask any intelligent and fairly educated Frenchman on what conditions he would part with it and note the indignant response. The Civil Code has achieved victories, no less renowned in peace than those that first made the victor of Marengo famous. Nay,

Napoleon himself, warrior as he was, felt that the great glory of his reign was written within the covers of his Code and that he would live by the peaceful triumphs that it wrought when Austerlitz and Jena were forgotten. Upon his greatness as a lawgiver he based his appeal to posterity, and time, thus far, has ratified his claims." The argument is plausible, and as a plea resting upon actual experiment is deserving of consideration.

Assuming, in the first place, that the Code Napoleon has triumphantly answered the expectations of its framers and has proved an efficient agent in the world's progress, it is important to examine into the sources of its existence and the causes of its success. We will readily perceive that there is no just reason to suppose that there is such a similarity between the situation that produced the French Code and that in which we now find ourselves. To admit the imperative necessity of a code for France one hundred years ago does not in the slightest degree prove that the admirable system of our English common law should give way to those who are ready to attempt the duty and to encounter the responsibility of its codification.

When the French Revolution broke out and violently removed the ancient land-marks, France found herself in a singularly confused condition. It is an old saying, none the wiser for being habitually clothed in Latin dress, that the condition of a country is one of wretched servitude where the law is vague and uncertain. If this be true, the condition of the people was indeed deplorable, especially when the central power upon which so much of the system depended was ruthlessly removed and the uncertainty of jurisprudence was no longer mitigated by the supervision and control of despotic power. France was divided into two great principal jurisdictions: one in the north was governed by the *droit coutumier,* the other in the south by the written law. The former was the offshoot and legacy of Germanic invasion; the latter testified to the supremacy of Rome. In addition to these two sources of jurisprudence, the relations of persons and the disposition of lands was to some extent governed by feudal restrictions and practices. In fact, the law founded upon custom or *coutume* was partly made up of common law and partly of feudal law. Nor could it be said that the same *coutume* extended over any considerable extent of country, for each province, nay district, boasted of its own *coutume*

and administered it all the more tenaciously, because it differed from that which prevailed in the adjoining territory. When the fires of the Revolution were first kindled, there were in France no less than two hundred and sixty *coutumes*. Practically there were two hundred and sixty codes in vigor, to harass the population of the country. The evil was and had been so great that as far back as the time of Louis XI. efforts had been made to codify the law. Colbert took it up and so much progress was made that a Civil Code was promulgated, but this was in reality nothing more than a Code of Procedure. It was only after Bonaparte came into power as Consul that the labor of centuries culminated in the present Code, and thenceforth, for the first time in her history, France was endowed with a national homogeneous system of equal laws.

This necessarily brief and imperfect statement may suffice to show the different situations of France in 1789 and of the State of New York in 1893 relatively to each other. France absolutely required *a* system to wipe out hundreds of conflicting systems of law. Successions were regulated by different rules, according to the districts in which the property was situate. The rights dependent upon marriage contract changed their character as the parties took short journeys from home. The practice of the courts was as multiform as the rights which they were created to enforce. The nation was reduced to such straits that any change, provided it brought unity and simplicity, was sure to prove a blessing. Who will venture to say that there is any ground for comparison between the case thus presented and our own? Admirable as the French system may be, and is in many particulars, I have yet to discover the man of reasonable intelligence and education who believes that the rights of property and of person are not as safe within our borders as in France or any other country governed by the Civil Code. So true is this that the most earnest advocate of codification does not propose to change the law. He only seeks to change its dress. In this would codification with us be unique. Elsewhere it has been invoked, to remedy imperfect legislation and to remove objectionable customs which only the radical remedies of wholesale codification could effect.

It has been conceded above, and indeed it is claimed, that the Code Napoleon has proved to be a great step in advance, perhaps

one of the most efficient auxiliaries, of modern European progress. It has at least consecrated the absolute equality of all men before the law. For this alone it deserves honor and respect. But what remains of the argument, so far as it is based on experience, if we should admit that the model code has fallen short of its promise and proved itself a failure? And yet this is precisely what Mr. Austin, one of the most conspicuous defenders of codification (in the abstract) most emphatically proclaims. He does not even undertake to show that the efforts of Napoleon as a law-maker were ineffectual. He starts out to show *why* the French Code turned out to be a failure! Space will not allow the reproduction of his curious arguments in support of so doubtful a proposition; much less any criticism to disprove the value of his strictures. If Mr. Austin were not so serious as well as so eminent an author, we could hardly escape the conclusion that much of his writing upon the subject was done while in a humorous vein. For instance: "No code can be perfect; there should therefore be a *perpetual provision for its amendment, or suggestions from the judges* who are engaged in applying it, and who are in the best of all situations for observing its defects. By this means *the growth of a judiciary law* explanatory of and supplementary to a code cannot be indeed prevented altogether, but it may be kept within a reasonable bulk by being worked into the code itself from time to time"! (Jurisprudence 2, p. 127.)

What a prospect this unfolds to the admiring eye of the seeker after condensation! The only escape from unreasonable bulk lying in the facility to expand the Code! We of New York will not dispute the proposition. We have a melancholy instance in the swelling volumes of our Code of Practice. These have at least been useful to show that the growth of judiciary law and unreasonable bulk in a code might amicably increase and multiply in harmony. Is it easier to regulate the concerns of a State, to define the duties of parent and child, master and servant, landlord and agent, than to provide for the commencement of a suit or the service of a summons? If it is, a civil code may be practicable in our State; but, instructed by the example of France, let us remember that she allowed, notwithstanding the pressure of her necessities, two centuries to intervene between the Practice Code of Colbert and the Civil Code of Napoleon.

F. R. COUDERT.

NEEDED REFORMS IN THE ARMY.

BY GEN. JOHN GIBBON, U. S. A.

In a country with as small an army as ours the popular desire is, and ought to be, to have the organization as perfect as is possible and as is consistent with the circumstances of the case, so that when war comes, as it is very sure to do, sooner or later, this small force can be made use of to the greatest possible advantage in leavening, in the shortest time, the much larger armies which the extent of our country will necessitate. Important as this is, so far as concerns what is known as the *line* of the army, it is of far greater importance as regards the *staff*—the several departments which issue orders and instructions and furnish the supplies of all kinds to a military force.

"In time of peace prepare for war," and if in time of peace we follow a system not applicable in time of war, our labor is worse than thrown away; for we not only have to abandon the peace system, but we have to go to work and learn an entirely new one under the most disadvantageous circumstances.

The terms "precedence in command" and "succession in command" are well known in all armies. With active armies in the field there is never any difficulty in acknowledging them or construing them. If the Commanding General of an army is killed or disappears from any cause, the one next in rank steps into his position with all the rights and authority of his predecessor. And if from any cause he absents himself he is bound to transfer his command to the next in rank, for the *law* says that the next "*shall* command." If a colonel at the head of his regiment, or a captain at the head of his company, be killed or wounded, the officer next in rank in the regiment or company takes his place without orders or question. There is no need for

orders in the case. The matter is fixed by *law*, which takes precedence of all orders and regulations.

In the case of army commanders the matter is so far modified that the President, when he desires a change, designates the one he desires to succeed to the command, and he can assign a junior to command over the heads of his seniors ; but this does not militate against the general rule followed in case of a sudden vacancy in the command or the temporary absence of the commander. The rule governs in all cases until the President is heard from, or "otherwise specially directs."

For the purpose of discipline and general administration of the troops, the country is divided into a number of geographical or military departments, to each one of which the President "assigns" a commander, as he does in the case of armies in the field. These departments are assimilated to armies, and their commanders have essentially the same powers and duties as army commanders. Of course, they are "military" commands, and should be governed by the same rules as apply to all military commands. There are now eight of these departments, each under command of (usually) a general officer. Should, however, this officer drop dead, or from any other cause make a vacancy, the law plainly prescribes who (the next in rank) shall assume the duties and command until the will of the President is made known. So, too, if a department commander leaves the limits of his command, he is bound to notify the next in rank and turn over to him the command. To fail to do this, besides being a violation of the law, has some other disadvantages. It mortifies the next in rank by failing to bestow upon him what the law says he *shall* have, and it *degrades* the commission which he holds from the highest authority in the nation.

It has been suggested that the law may be considered to have been "modified" by the existing system of railroads and telegraphs, but the idea of bestowing upon railroads and telegraphs the power given exclusively *to Congress* can scarcely be seriously entertained in a country with free institutions. It may be urged that to comply with the law is sometimes very inconvenient, the next in rank being perhaps hundreds of miles away. This, however, is an argument which the pettiest violator of law is apt to make use of, and it is *never* any excuse for failing to comply with the demands of the law. Once accustom people, and especially

soldiers, to disregard the law in *any* respect, and you open the gate to a disregard of *all* law.

In former days a post commander would never dream of leaving his command without turning it over to the next in rank, or if he did not do it, the next in rank assumed command as a matter of course. So far as the law and customs of service are concerned, a post is different in no respect from a department, and yet a law officer of the government has decided that *personal vresence* is not essential in commanding a military department. In this decision, however, the only law which really applies to the question (Art. of War 122) is ignored. Carry that decision to its logical sequence and it is a fatal blow to all succession in command, post, regiment, or any other, and to proper discipline. This loose method of command, it is stated, was once carried so far that a department commander *absent in Europe* exercised command over American soldiers. Numerous instances are on record where the senior officer has *assumed* command, but in modern times the officer who attempts it does so at his peril. His commission, of course, is in no danger so long as he acts legally, but he may find it is not as strong a piece of parchment as he thought and that it possesses some disadvantages he never before dreamed of. A return to the former custom and a strict conformity to the law is desirable in order to check a fast growing disposition to regard military command as a *personal* attribute, instead of an attribute of the commission, as is the case *in time of war*.

Non-military people will naturally inquire: "Who does exercise command when the *assigned* officer is absent?" The answer is: a staff officer, two, three or four grades in rank below the one designated by law. General Scott used to say: "Nature does not abhor a vacuum half as much as a senior abhors being commanded by his junior." Nowadays this abhorrence is excited but too frequently and to the great detriment of military discipline.

An army should be constituted and conducted on purely business principles and ours, except in part, is not. Commencing at the bottom, the method of making appointments in the Medical Corps and in the Ordnance Department is everything that could be desired. It would be well for the service and for the Corps of Engineers if the same system of appointment were followed in that corps as is pursued in the Ordnance Department. Instead of assigning young officers directly to the corps

on graduation from the Academy, they should be placed at first in the line for a tour of duty, that it might be determined whether the practical course in the army confirmed the theoretical judgment of individuals formed at West Point. This course would benefit the corps and the army, as well as the individuals.

When an officer is once assigned to a regiment or corps his promotion takes place in accordance with well-established laws, free from all extraneous influences, with the exception of the examination which takes place before boards to decide as to whether he is fit for promotion. But where *special selections* are made for service in the staff there are, strange to say, no rules whatever for the government of the selections with the one exception of the Ordnance Department. In the vast majority of cases the probabilities are in favor of the selections being made from the one particular interest which should have nothing to do with the organization of an army, if efficiency is desired or aimed at. This is true not only of the selections made for the lowest grades in the staff corps, but for the highest in *all* branches of the service. During the past twenty-five or thirty years there has been but one period of four years where political as well as personal influence has not had an undue share in these selections.

In time of peace the same rules which govern in all other professions and business corporations should prevail in the army. Length of service, capacity and the *record* made by the officer should determine his selection for promotion, and in no other way can we hope for an efficient and capable organization. When two officers are considered as equal in capacity and record, *length of service* should decide the question. In selections for higher grades the rule should be rigid, that where *the senior is competent he should be promoted.* Few out of the military service can form the slightest idea of the fatal blows discipline and efficiency have received by appointments made on any other grounds than those of efficiency and rank. Men naturally strive after those things deemed most conducive to their own interests. If political and personal influence are made the test, officers will become politicians and strive after personal influence. If soldierly qualities are the test, officers will strive to be soldiers deserving of the prizes which *ought* to be the reward of soldierly record.

The proposed rules of selection would remove promotion in the army from all political influence and rid the service from the

demoralizing and frequently discreditable scramble for office always presented when one of these selected positions becomes vacant. Such a course as is now followed may be good politics, but it is the worst possible political economy and is fraught with future evils to our little army. Even fools do not place the worst material in the foundations of the houses they build.

But by far the greatest evil which threatens the welfare of our army in the future, is the centralizing tendency of all army administration, which saps discipline, destroys the proper authority of even the highest military men in their own commands, and actually *invites* subordinates to be insubordinate—to disobey the orders of their legal superiors. This tendency has reached such an extent that it bids fair in the near future to concentrate in Washington complete control of all military operations, usurping the determination of the most trivial questions which should be decided in the geographical departments and never be permitted to reach Washington. It deprives all officers, even department commanders, of any proper control over their commands. This has proceeded so far already that the control of all the details of army matters is rapidly passing into the hands of two or three staff departments, these staff departments themselves not being under control of the Commanding General of the Army.

Any attempt to change this condition of affairs is sure to result in the cry that *military* authorities are trying to interfere with the lawful prerogatives of the Secretary of War, whose name and authority is invoked to support all assumptions of these several departments. The result of this is, that officers on the frontier have nothing to do, while the staff officers in Washington are overwhelmed with a perfect deluge of business impossible for them to perform properly, and which has really to be done by irresponsible clerks. In individual cases, when the staff officer is conscientious and zealous he is worked to death. In other cases he simply signs his name to a multitude of papers prepared for him by his numerous clerks. He has no time to do much else.

One of the worst features of this tendency towards centralization is, that it is rapidly transforming our army into a mere *paper* machine. Requisitions, returns, reports, Board proceedings, in duplicate, triplicate and quadruplicate, block army administration in every direction, and accumulate papers to such an extent that the transportation from station to station of the retained

papers in the Quartermaster's Department alone has become a tax of no insignificant amount on the government, whilst the shelves of the War Department are clogged with them. Of all useless things in the world a *paper* soldier is the most useless.

In every properly organized army, if a subordinate commander requires mules, horses, wagons, guns, ammunition, provisions, or anything else, the Commanding General, if he approves, orders the articles furnished. By no other plan could the efficiency of the army be assured. In our army, on the contrary, these questions, or most of them, are decided by the heads of staff departments in Washington. The commander seldom has a chance to express even an opinion upon the advisability of supplying the articles called for by his subordinates. So far has this system gone that the tables in the War Department are loaded down with papers relating to questions and articles of supplies which never should have left the geographical departments whence they came and where the questions involved could have been settled more satisfactorily and for the better interests of the service, to say nothing of delays in the matter.

Business men would be both amused and surprised to learn the way in which some insignificant article required at a distant frontier post is supplied. A piece of machinery used in supplying the garrison with water, or any other article of vital importance at a post, but insignificant in Washington, is required out at some post in Montana. A requisition is made for it. Ths goes to St. Paul (Department Headquarters); from there it comes to Washington, and after going through the regular red tape course, it is decided by some subordinate in the Quartermaster General's office that the article can be purchased by the Depot Quartermaster at St. Paul, to which point the requisition goes back with the order for the purchase. It is purchased then and goes out to Montana, where the post has possibly been burnt down for the want of a water supply.

It is true there is an "emergency" clause in the law, under which such articles can be purchased in open market, or on short notice, but this requires the issuance of an order from somebody, which must afterwards be approved by somebody else in Washington. I was once travelling through the wilds of Oregon with a small escort and an army wagon, when one of the tires came off. Some years ago there would have been no difficulty about resort-

ing to the nearest blacksmith shop for the necessary repairs, for the Regulations covered all such cases, but the commander of the escort dared not settle it in that way now, and had to have a written order declaring it an emergency case.

By the Constitution the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces is vested in Congress, but for many years the power to make regulations for the army has been left to the Executive, Congress limiting itself to the enactment of the *rules* as laid down in the Articles of War. Regulations for the government of an army *ought* to be of such a character as to form a sure guide for all officers and soldiers—a rudder by which the military ship could always be steered.

The Regulations now in existence form no guide at all, for almost immediately after they were issued the War Department commenced to make, by orders or circulars, all sorts of modifications to this, that, or the other paragraph, until these have become so numerous that no one *can* know what the present regulation is on many points unless he is fortunate enough to possess an industrious and capable clerk who keeps his copy of the Regulations posted as he would a day-book. A regulation, to be any guide at all, ought to be a sure one, and if so many changes are necessary a much more useful publication for the army would be a yearly edition of the Regulations rather than a yearly Register.

I had it impressed upon my mind very early in my military life that *laws* and regulations were two distinct things, differing very essentially in power and authority; that the laws of Congress were things which, under no circumstances, could with propriety be disregarded or set aside, and that regulations, whilst made to be observed, possessed no such sacred character. For many years military courts have, with more or less strictness, adhered to this distinction, insisting that justice must be duly administered "without partiality, favor or affection, *according to the provisions of the Rules and Articles for the Government of the Armies of the United States*" (Articles of War), and have refused to try charges based on a *violation* of the *Regulations*.

If exceptions to this rule have now and then occurred, I think it may be directly traced to the degradation inflicted upon the highest court in the military service whereby the highest judicial prerogatives are imposed upon a less number of officers than the law declares a general court martial *shall* consist of. It is true that

the law leaves the determination of this question with the convening authority, but the question is restricted with the provision that the full number of thirteen cannot be convened "without manifest injury to the service." Where courts of less than thirteen are ordered, the convening authority inserts a clause that "no greater number can be convened without manifest injury to the service," when it is plainly "*manifest*" to every one connected with the service that this assertion is not true.

How is it possible to have anything like uniform or equal justice administered in an army where five or seven young officers, sometimes all stationed at the same post, are invested with all the powers (including that of life itself) bestowed upon the *Supreme* Court of the army of thirteen members? A return to the old custom of detailing full courts of thirteen members, and even sometimes detailing *alternates* to take the place of any who might not be able to attend, is desirable.

Of late years a great deal has been heard of the desertion of enlisted men and the fraudulent duplication of pay accounts by officers. By wise legislation and suitable orders the number of deserters has been very materially reduced in the last few years and will doubtless be still more reduced when these laws and orders have had time time to produce their effects.

No enlisted man ever draws his pay twice, unless by the blunder of both his commander and the paymaster. No one ever hears of an officer of the Navy duplicating his pay account. There must be some good reason for this. There is. *He has no pay accounts to duplicate,* and there is no necessity for army officers to have them. A naval officer draws his pay on a pay-roll similar to the muster and pay-roll on which the men of a company in the army are paid. He simply *receipts* for his pay either on the pay-roll, or, if this is beyond his reach, on a separate slip which is afterwards attached to the roll. The receipt is signed only when the pay is due, and it is not negotiable like our pay account. It is better to put it out of the power of the few disposed to commit crime, than to create a temptation to fraud.

All of these reforms are deemed necessary for the welfare of the army and they *can* all be brought about by the action of the Secretary of War without additional legislation.

JOHN GIBBON.

WHY IMMIGRATION SHOULD NOT BE SUSPENDED.

BY SENATOR HENRY C. HANSBROUGH, OF NORTH DAKOTA.

IMMIGRATION and quarantine are too closely allied, especially at this time, to admit of their discussion as separate questions. A seaboard quarantine along the Atlantic coast in the United States will not stand as a bar to the entrance of contagious or infectious diseases over the Canadian or Mexican borders. Nor will international plagues be kept out by a complete suspension of immigration unless we have the coöperation of all the governments on the Western Hemisphere, and even then I doubt its efficacy, for the European traveller, or the crews of vessels whose entrance to our ports cannot well be prohibited, would sow the deadly seed quite as readily and effectually as would the ragged immigrant.

If we say to the intending emigrant, "You shall not come to this country through the ports within our jurisdiction," he will easily find a convenient and, during the summer season, a more agreeable entrance through the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and thence via lake and rail to western points in the Dominion, whence he may enter the United States by as many different cross-roads as there are iron posts to mark the miles of the boundary line. Indeed, he need not go so far as the West; he may come in, with equal ease, from Montreal or Toronto. I do not understand that it is the purpose of those who are advocating suspension to exclude immigrants who may come from or through Canada and Mexico. To cut off immigration from these sources, in case of suspension at the seaboard, would require the services of a mounted patrol equal in numbers to our regular army.

It is unreasonable to suppose that the vessels now engaged in

carrying immigrants would go out of business in case of the passage of a suspension act. The companies owning them would continue to seek dividends upon their investments, and many of their ships would carry immigrants to the ports north of us. These companies, which are said to be making rich profits, would not tie up their vessels for a year so long as they could land immigrants in the depots of a great railway company whose lines, for a distance of three thousand miles, skirt the borders of the very country in which Europe's millions are seeking homes. The distance from Hamburg to Halifax is less than from Hamburg to New York by eight hundred miles, and less to Quebec by five hundred miles.

It is not at all probable that the Canadian Pacific road would refuse to carry immigrants to Western points on account of the prevailing desire in this country that the cholera be kept out of Chicago! It would be poor policy to divert the stream of immigration, or any part of it, from the customary channels and bid it enter the United States at any point along the six thousand miles of American border line, exposing the people who live contiguous thereto, as well as those in the interior of the country, to the danger of contact with imported diseases. So that if Chicago catches the cholera this year, the disease is more likely to make its entrance by way of Winnipeg or the great lake ports, should immigration be suspended by act of Congress, than it would be to break through the lines of an effective federal quarantine if immigration is not suspended. Advocates of a federal quarantine realize the consequences of a visitation of international plagues, and feel that the united powers of all the States should be exerted to check and control them at the very threshold of their entrance. It is unjust to the taxpayers of New York, Pennsylvania or Maryland to say that they shall pay the expenses of keeping the cholera out of Chicago, or that the people of Louisiana or Texas shall be assessed to prevent the spread of yellow fever to the adjoining State of Arkansas. These are matters that concern the people of the entire country, and the burden should be borne by the general government.

On the other hand, it is contended that a large revenue is derived by certain States as a result of State control—an amount, in some instances, far in excess of the State's quarantine expenses. If this is true it simply adds another argument, and a strong

one, in favor of federal control. The "power to regulate commerce with foreign nations" rests exclusively in Congress. Then who will attempt to maintain that a State should be permitted to levy tribute upon "foreign commerce" for the special benefit of the State? Fees derived from the regulation of foreign commerce belong to the people of the whole country, and every dollar now collected from the vessel owners in our harbors by State officials should be collected by federal officials and should go into the federal treasury for the maintenance of an efficient and well-equipped federal quarantine.

Think of the inconsistency of a proposition in favor of the general government collecting a fifty-cent tax from the individual immigrant while the State government takes the fees derived from the inspection of the immigrant vessel. It may fairly be presumed that the only thing that prevents the State from "going the government one better" in the matter of head tax is the selfish fear that the vessel owners would thereafter land their cargoes at rival ports.

The announcement that cholera has made its appearance anywhere within the bounds of civilization is cause for universal dread; when its germs are discovered in the remotest corner of our own country, there is consternation throughout the land. The same may be said with respect to yellow fever, although the alarm over this disease is not so great as formerly. It is a practical truth, therefore, to say that cholera and yellow fever are of national importance, and it is little less than a crime for a great political party, soon to assume responsibility for the sole management of the government, to permit the ancient delusion of State sovereignty to jeopardize the health and life of the people.

It is not denied that the power to deal with cholera and kindred diseases that come with foreign commerce is vested in the Federal Government. The eighth section of the very first article of the Constitution of the United States provides that "Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes." Under this clause of the Constitution the present Congress appropriated about $22,000,000 to remove obstructions from and otherwise improve our rivers and harbors, and each preceding Congress, since the foundation of the Government, has made appropriations for

tions, etc., and to fortify himself with the testimony of three reputable witnesses who become morally responsible for his conduct. Would it be too great a hardship upon the foreigner if we require him to take an oath before our consul or consular agent as to his character, good intentions, etc., and have that oath duly attested by two reputable witnesses who know him? Is it too much to say that he shall also be able to read and write his own language?

The law, as it now stands, prohibits the landing of all paupers, and of all persons who are likely to become a public charge, all idiots and insane persons; persons suffering from a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease; persons who have been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude; polygamists; any person whose ticket of passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown on special inquiry that such person does not belong to one of the excluded classes; also, all contract laborers. How much better for the immigrant, after landing, if the emigrant could read his title clear before sailing?

As is stated in the report of the Commissioner of Immigration, the character of the Europeans coming to this country for homes during the past year shows a decided improvement over previous years. There are other encouraging signs worthy of note. The general belief that immigrants are not immediate contributors to the wealth of the country, but bring with them only the rags upon their backs, is erroneous. As an example: For the last half of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, the 152,360 immigrants over twenty years of age who arrived at the port of New York brought with them $3,060,908.05, or $20 09 each. The adult French immigrants brought an average of $55.67; the Swiss are next highest in the list, the Welsh third, and the Germans fourth. Hungary, Italy, and Poland are lowest, showing an average of $11.75 each adult. Strange as it may seem when we remember the miserable appearance of the Russian immigrants, the figures show that they brought $22.10 per (adult) capita.

But the strong, honest healthy immigrant brings more than the paltry dollars in his pocket. He brings value difficult to estimate. In a book published in 1870 by Frederick Knapp, then Commissioner of Immigration of the State of New York, the aver-

age economic value of each immigrant is given at $1,125.* Norwegians who come here have very little money, but they are the least illiterate of any of our immigrants, and experience shows that for industry and frugality they are unexcelled.

Our best immigrants are those who bring their families with them, and, when they have earned sufficient money, send for their relatives. It is interesting to study the official figures† in this respect, for we discover in them the motive of the immigrant, and when we find his motive we may judge of his worth to the community. Of the 51,383 Irish who came during the past fiscal year, 25,684 were females. There were 119,168 Germans, of whom 52,271 were females. Italy sent 61,631 in all, only

* What is the economic value, says Mr. Knapp, of each immigrant to the country of his adoption? We are perfectly familiar with the estimates which, during the existence of slavery, were made of the value of negroes. A good field hand was considered to be worth $1,200 and over; a good cook was valued higher; and a seamstress or housekeeper was, in some cases, held at even $1,500 or $2,000. In order to obtain a proper idea of the importance of immigration to the United States, we must endeavor to capitalize, so to speak, the addition to the natural and intellectual resources of the country represented by each immigrant.

Dr. Engel computes the cost of raising a manual laborer in Germany at 40 thalers a year for the first five years of his life; at 50 thalers for the next five years, and at 60 thalers from the eleventh to the fifteenth year, thus arriving at an average of 50 thalers per year, or 750 thalers in all. From my knowledge of German life I consider this estimate as correct as it can be, and assuming that in this country subsistence costs about twice as much as in Germany, I do not think I shall be far from the truth in doubling Engel's estimates, and in assuming the expense of bringing up an American farmer or unskilled laborer for the first fifteen years of his life to average 100 thalers per year, or a total of 1,500 thalers, equal to about $1,500 currency. Following Dr. Engel's estimate, an American girl will be found to cost only about half of that, or $750, for the reason that she becomes useful to the household from an earlier age. Allowance must be made, it is true, for the fact that about one-fifth of the immigrants are less than fifteen years old; but this is fully balanced by the great preponderance of men and women and by thousands who represent the highest order of skilled labor. Hence, I feel safe in assuming the capital value of each male and female immigrant to be $1,500 and $750 respectively for every person of either sex, making an average for both of $1,125.

† In the following table will appear the number and per cent. of immigrants of each sex, from the leading countries of Europe, arriving from 1881 to 1889, inclusive.

Country from which arrived.	Males.	Per cent. males of total.	Females.	Per cent. females of total.	Total.
Germany	836,290	57.6	616,680	42.4	1,452,970
Ireland	334,229	51.0	321,253	49.0	655,482
England	395,273	61.3	249,407	38.7	644,680
Sweden and Norway	346,862	61.0	221,500	39.0	568,362
Italy	243,923	79.4	63,386	20.6	307,309
Russia, including Poland	174,481	65.8	90,607	34.2	265,088
Austria	142,221	62.9	83,817	37.1	226,038
Hungary	94,243	73.8	33,438	26.2	127,681
Scotland	92,252	61.6	57,617	38.4	149,869

14,232 of whom were females. These figures by contrast conclusively show the necessity for extraordinary care on the part of the Government in making selections of those who are to people this country. The immigrant who brings his wife comes to stay. He assimilates rapidly, and his offspring make good Americans.

That Congress has the right to pass laws for the suspension of immigration, and that such laws would not be in contravention of treaty obligations, will scarcely admit of dispute, but that the enactment of a measure of this character would be in the interest of sound public policy may be very seriously questioned.

H. C. HANSBROUGH.

THE HOPE OF A HOME.

BY ERASTUS WIMAN.

IN THE great cities of this mighty nation of forty nations, where there ought to be plenty of room and plenty of prosperity, the proportion of homes owned by their occupants varies greatly. In the newer and smaller cities the proportion of individual proprietorship greatly exceeds that which prevails in the older and larger cities, with the single exception of Philadelphia, which has become proverbial as a City of Homes. The forces that have been at work in these newer cities, and in Philadelphia, in the process of home-getting, it is important to discuss, in order that they may be more generally understood and more generally applied, so that a greater number may be blessed with that most hopeful of hopes, the hope of a home.

It shows the slow growth in economic science, as compared with progress in other departments of intellectual activity, that there has been so little attention given by writers and financiers to the possible cessation or material reduction of rent. The universality of rent payment by the class least able to bear its burden is a reflection at once upon the philanthropy and financial acumen of the age. For there is no tax more onerous on labor or employment than this monthly exaction for the privilege of shelter, and nothing so destructive of thrift as the unceasing demand for tribute for a place in which to eat and sleep, or in which to lodge the belongings of the great army of wage-earners. The Indian in the forest may own his tepee, the Arab in the desert his tent, but in large aggregations of humanity, great groups of the civilized sons of men have not where to lay their heads, except at a cost that keeps them forever slaves to this first charge upon all their efforts.

Certainly, of all cities on this continent, New York is the most exaggerated specimen of failure in the matter of homes for the class on whom, to a greater degree than any other, its prosperity depends. The individual proprietorship of homes by the skilled

workmen or laboring class in New York is exceedingly small, and even among the class supposed to be more liberally compensated, such as clerks, salesmen, operators, and the host of men and women who by brain and hand wrest a living from the world, the number who own homes of their own in the metropolis is very limited.

A recent census report shows that there are 81,000 houses in New York occupied by a number of families so great as to imply that there are nearly four families (3.82) for every house in the metropolis. When it is recalled that there are thousands of beautiful homes in New York occupied each by one family only, that miles of avenues and streets are lined with houses each individually owned and occupied by one family group, it will be realized to what extent in other parts of the city crowding occurs, when to accommodate an average of nearly four families to each house the remaining houses only are available. Comparing the condition of New York with Philadelphia the difference is most marked. In Philadelphia the average number of families to each house is one family and one-tenth, as against three families and over three-quarters in New York for each house. In New York the average for each house is 19 people, while in Philadelphia the average is not 6 people per house. The death rate tells the rest. In New York it is 28 in every thousand ; in Philadelphia 22 per thousand. While New York has 19 people to each house, London has only seven, with a death rate three per cent. lower than New York.

The extent of the crowding in New York is made painfully apparent by the statement of the national census, which shows that out of a population of 1,600,000, no less a number than 1,200,000 live in apartments, flats, and tenements. Still further is this confirmed by the sanitary census made by the police in September last, in which it was found that there were herded in what the Board of Health designates as the "Tenement District" no less than 276,000 families ! This number, exceeding a quarter of a million families, averaging five persons in each, is so great as to excite surprise that such a condition can exist in the chief city of the new world, where conditions of civilization, as illustrated by the character and number of homes, ought to have their most perfect exemplification. But, alas ! the facts as presented in official reports, in the death rate, and in the personal observations of men and women who take a deep interest in the condition of human kind in the metropolis, show a state of

density full of danger, in which the indications towards improvement are few and far between.

But not to New York alone is confined the disposition towards density, but it exists in Boston, in Baltimore, in Pittsburg, and numerous other cities. Indeed, in almost every locality is there need for the encouragement of home building. Hence the desirability of considering the possibility of assisting an expansion into more commodious quarters by suburban development on the one hand, and, on the other, by the erection in the cities themselves of modern apartment-houses ten and twelve stories high, which shall be *owned* by the parties living in them. How this best can be done is shown by the experience in Philadelphia principally, and by numerous imitators in various parts of the country in the operations of Building-Loan Associations.

It is not improbable that the reader, if he or she has not already mastered the principles that underlie these simple organizations, will stop at this point and proceed no further. The disinclination to get down into detail is universal, and it is especially difficult to elicit attention to the dry details of what seems to be a complex plan of finance. But when the reader is told that there are not a dozen financial magnates on Wall Street that have yet comprehended this scheme of home-getting, though it is known to hundreds of thousands of plain people who know nothing of Wall Street, perhaps interest will be sufficiently excited to pursue the subject further. Perhaps if the reader also understands that more real, substantial good has been brought about by the operations of the simple workingmen who have promoted these societies for home-getting than has been achieved by all the operators on Wall Street, a desire may be evinced to understand the simple plan by which so much has been accomplished, so little lost, and a vast permanent benefit to thousands achieved.

The general idea of Building-Loan Associations is hardly conveyed by the name by which they are designated. They are simply societies for saving, with the accumulations sacredly dedicated to the payment for homes solely for members of the society. Any one who can save one dollar and a half a month is eligible for membership. Any group, however insignificant or remote, can form a society. The only thing necessary is a trusty treasurer, who shall safely hold the combined monthly savings of the

members until enough is accumulated to build a home. Then the accumulations are loaned, either by auction or by lot, or by universal choice, to one of the members, to be paid out, not to the member, but to the builder of the house as it progresses, or in one sum to the owner of the house if it is completed and ready for transfer to the member. The society takes a mortgage for the amount advanced, which mortgage will be liquidated by the member paying up his monthly instalments, he having subscribed for a sufficient amount of the stock of the society to pay the mortgage in a given period, which generally averages nine years. The member enters into possession, pays a little more than rent, while his payments are towards a purchase and not towards rent. At the end of nine years, if he were a tenant he would have a bundle of landlord's receipts, and be no better off than at the start. If he is a purchaser, and every month pays his dues and interest, at the end of nine years he has a deed, free and clear, to his own home.

In the meantime, this member's payments of principal and interest into the society, in liquidation of his debt, are reloaned to another member, which, with continued payments of others who have bought homes, and the savings of those who need not buy them, form a fund from which a steady flow of homes are being created. It is a never-ceasing stream of payments and repayments, of interest, and of savings, fed by a thousand rivulets, all converging to one point, and all ending in the blessing of a home. It is a diversion of the enormous volume of rental into an equally enormous volume of purchase, with this difference, that the purchase money is again and again performing the same work, and fulfilling the highest and noblest purpose which it is possible for thrift to fulfil, the creation of homes.

It may be alleged that in borrowing money at six per cent. with which to build a home, the poor man pays as much in interest as tenements yield, and that the added instalment of principal, which he monthly has to pay, unduly taxes him. In reply to this it can be urged that, while six per cent. is a profit that landlords would generally be glad to be secure in, the depreciation of property by tenants is much greater than that which is likely to take place on houses owned by their occupants. Indeed, the general result has been that in well-chosen suburbs an appreciation of value has taken place through the community of building which such a

society for saving renders possible. Thus the home-builder gets the advantage of the "unearned increment," which otherwise would be entirely denied him.

It should also be borne in mind that the six per cent. interest paid by the borrower he practically pays to himself, in direct proportion to his holdings of stock in the society. True, he pays six per cent., and with the premium which is demanded for the money, and other charges, it looks like eight per cent. But, as a matter of fact, so full of advantage is the constant compounding of interest from monthly payments of both principal and interest that as a rule the operations of the society yield him a sufficient profit to reduce the average amount of his interest charges to four and a half per cent. Thus he borrows at the lowest possible rate on mortgages and gets the largest possible rate consistent with safety on the investment of his savings. To those members of the society who do not build, or do not need to borrow, the return is rarely less than eight per cent. To lend money at four and a half per cent. and to pay dividends at the rate of eight per cent. is an operation in finance to which even Wall Street is a stranger!

One element of weakness seemed to exist in the plan pursued by Building-Loan Associations, and that was that in the event of the death of the borrowing member his payments on his stock might cease. This would result in the foreclosure of the mortgage and the loss of the home to the stricken family, thus sweeping away the savings of years, except so far as an equity would be realized. Against the dread contingeney of death and loss, the writer of this article has had the happiness of making a suggestion that has not only been universally approved, but successfully applied. The suggestion is that Building-Loan Associations, on application from borrowing members, may insure the lives of these in some first-class insurance company for a limited term, for the amount of the unpaid instalments due on the house. The payments for this insurance being divided into monthly sums are very small, and are made simultaneously with the principal and interest. As the instalments reduce the debt on the home, the insurance risk equally diminishes, and the cost of it declines, so that, towards the end, it is almost infinitesimal. Meantime the safety obtained improves the security of the loan to the society, and, above all, makes the possession of the home certain to the family. If the bread-winner lives he pays by his instalments for it; if he dies

it is paid for by the insurance company, so, whether living or dying, the home is secure. The Travellers' Life Insurance Company, of Hartford, Conn., having early apprehended the possibilities of embodying the element of safety with the element of thrift in the gradual purchase of homes, has provided a policy that exactly meets the necessities of the case, and has thus afforded a facility of great value in the securing of a home.

It is not for the investments of the well-to-do that these savings-societies exist. It is for the infinitely vaster sum which it is possible to glean from the savings of the great wage-earning class, which in this country possesses a saving power of immense force. It is for the purpose of encouraging not only saving in itself, but of begetting an added force in its periodicity or regularity which a monthly undertaking to save any given sum implies. Only about every fifth individual is of an economical turn of mind ; it is important to cultivate the virtue of thrift in the other four. In order to do so the facility afforded by the Building-Loan Associations presents itself and its discipline of regularity by demanding a monthly contribution to its coffers. This periodicity has a great force, and as soon as the expenditures of any considerable number in a community, in a workshop, in a church, in a society, or in an organization of any kind, are so arranged as to allow regular monthly contributions towards these savings-societies, it will be seen that the rivulets soon become rivers, and rivers soon become oceans in amount and influence.

The rivulets of savings from the individuals forming the great army of depositors in the savings-banks of New York city illustrate what enormous aggregations may be reached when it is stated that these deposits now reach the sum of $375,000,000. This 375 millions, deposited in small sums in the dozen savings-banks of one city, is not the property of the rich, nor is it the property of the poor. It is owned by the fourth or fifth member of the great middle class of toilers and workers, and is a monument to the virtue of thrift, of which New York city may be more proud than of any other monument it contains.

But attention is drawn to the fact that of this vast sum not a dollar can be, or is likely to be, used for the purpose of erecting homes for the very class who own the money, or those who mostly need them. The law and the policy by which the savings-banks are regulated make it impossible for them to make advances to

the builders of the small homes, while the prejudice and density of the ignorance of savings-bank officials as to the possible element of safety, profit, and beneficence contained in the principles underlying the Building-Loan Associations, make any change at present impossible. Time, and a public acquaintance with the possibilities of these principles, may bring about such an understanding of them, and such an appreciation of them, that a perfect revolution will be rendered possible, even by the aid of the savings-banks themselves, in the economic conditions regarding rental and home-buying which at present prevail.

This revolution might first find its field in the diversion of the savings of the working-class towards the creation of great edifices in the city of tenements for their occupancy, and which they themselves should own. This ownership might be in the shape of certificates of shares in the corporation which erects the building, in proportion to their contributions or savings, and which could be as readily negotiated or converted into cash as any deposits in savings-banks, or as the deeds of a house and lot. If certificates of shares were undesirable and a title in fee were thought better, even this form of proprietorship could be secured, prevailing as it already does in some few flats or apartment-houses owned in New York. The dividends on the total rental received from the building would, of course, amount to the sum paid by each tenant; so that, the investment once completed, the tenant would sit free of rent, and thus realize the full advantage of years of saving and judicious investment. If there is any safer investment than New York first-class tenement property, modernized and rendered fireproof, inhabited by its own owners, earning liberal wages and on the high road to independence, it is difficult to find it. If there is a more profitable way in which to invest money than to save it and put it into homes for those who can as surely pay for them as they can pay for their bread and butter, it is impossible to find it in these days of plethora and phenomenal accumulations of money.

An accumulation of 375 millions in the savings banks by the working people of New York on the one hand, and a census of homes on the other which shows 276,000 families in tenement houses as they now exist within a stone's throw of these banks, indicate a misdirection of finance that needs reformation.

But leaving these beneficent savings-banks to work out

their useful mission, it is submitted that the experience of other cities, and the perfect application of the principles of Building-Loan Associations, call for a more general understanding of their beneficence, profit, and safety by the public. This experience and this perfection of plan demand also a broader application of these ideas in remedying the difficulties and disabilities under which New York labors in the housing of her skilled workmen and her great laboring class. Without some great change in this respect, her future as a commercial and manufacturing centre is less secure than even her greatest advocates suppose. The certainty of increase in her population to dimensions of another million, within the lifetime of children now living, makes it imperative that a change should take place in the provision for those on whom her prosperity and supremacy depend.

Enlarged areas by amalgamating with Brooklyn, perfect communication with that section of the metropolis, and its expansion so as to include all the space between the East River and the sea, will be a relief of great moment. Equally, the inclusion of Staten Island on the south, with its magnificent water front and lovely interior, and, still further, the acquisition of the remainder of Westchester County on the north, open up a vista for homes extremely attractive. But, to procure these, the capital must be provided and the machinery set in motion, and in no way can that be more readily done than in the promotion of the operations of Building-Loan Associations by the public-spirited citizens of the metropolis. To achieve this, let there be an organization formed to be called The Society for the Encouragement of Thrift, whose sole purpose shall be the creation, the encouragement, and the oversight of Building-Loan Associations.

All other localities in this fair land, be they large or small, are intensely interested in the question of home-getting. No movement is more productive of the noblest and best efforts of human kind, and there is no greater safety for the republic than is founded on the universality of homes owned by the working people.

ERASTUS WIMAN.

EUROPE AT THE WORLD'S FAIR.

I. THE BRITISH SECTION.

BY SIR HENRY TRUEMAN WOOD, SECRETARY TO THE BRITISH COMMISSION.

IT HAS generally been the practice of the British Government in the case of important International Exhibitions to appoint a Royal Commission for the management of its Section. Such commissions are usually formed of a number of distinguished persons, and, in many cases, they have been under the presidency of the Prince of Wales.

These Exhibition Commissions have not taken a very active part in the organization, or usually held many meetings, all the executive work being left to the secretary, and their duties being confined to a nominal supervision, but they have always been held responsible for the proper discharge of the work and their authority and influence have naturally proved valuable.

At Paris in 1867 the post of secretary was held by Sir Henry Cole; at Vienna in 1874, and at Paris in 1878, it was occupied by Sir Philip Cunliffe-Owen. On both the latter occasions the Prince of Wales, as president, took a very active part in the organization, and the great success achieved by the British Section in 1878 was, to a large extent, due to this cause, and also to the able administration of Sir Philip Cunliffe-Owen.

This plan was not adopted at the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia. A Departmental Commission was then appointed by the Science and Art Department, consisting of two Commissioners, Sir Herbert Sandford and Mr. Archer, who undertook and carried out satisfactorily all the details of the administration.

As the British Government declined to take any part in the Paris Exhibition of 1889, a private committee was formed, under the presidency of the Lord Mayor of London, and by this body

the duties usually belonging to a Royal Commission were satisfactorily performed. The administration was of necessity economical, but I think none the less efficient.

When, in March 1891, the American Minister at the Court of St. James invited the British Government to take part in the World's Fair, Lord Salisbury at once replied that a Royal Commission should be appointed for the purpose. No steps, however, were taken in the matter for some time, and eventually the Prime Minister advised Her Majesty, instead of appointing a Commission of the ordinary character, to nominate the Council of the Society of Arts a Royal Commission for the exhibition.

This Society, the oldest of its sort in the world, was founded in 1754 for the purpose of encouraging the Arts, Manufactures and Commerce of the British kingdom and its dependencies, including at that time the territories which are now the United States of America. Many articles in the early transactions of the Society are devoted to the productions of "His Majesty's Colonies and Plantations in North America," and in one of the first lists of its members occurs the name of Benjamin Franklin.

The Society has a good claim to be considered actually the originator of exhibitions. It is a question whether there ever was any exhibition before that of "Agricultural Implements and Other Machines" held in 1761 at the Society of Arts. It was in the Society that the idea of the great exhibition of 1851 originated, and by the Society that its early organization was carried on. The London Exhibition of 1862 was also started and carried through its early stages by the Society, which has been closely associated in various ways with all the important London exhibitions which have since been held. There was thus good reason for the appointment of its Council as a Commission for Chicago, and the appointment has since been justified by the active interest taken in the work of the Exposition by the Council collectively and by its individual members.

When the Royal Commission was first appointed a grant was made of £25,000 ($125,000), with the idea that any further funds might be raised by payments to be made by exhibitors, a similar arrangement having been found to work very successfully in the case of the Paris Exhibition of 1889. In making so small a grant the government could not foresee the importance which the Chicago Exhibition rapidly assumed, and the fact was soon realized

that the occasion was worthy of more liberal treatment. On the usual formal application being made to Parliament to authorize the payment, an animated debate took place, and a general feeling was expressed from all sides of the House that the grant ought to be considerabiy increased.

Increased it accordingly was to £60,000 ($300,000), a sum which, though much smaller than the amounts voted by other important contributing countries, experience has shown to be sufficient for the practical purposes of an exhibition. In 1878, at Paris, the expenditure was $335,000; in Vienna, $145,000; in Philadelphia $200,000, while at Paris in 1889 $150,000 proved quite sufficient. It is true that $630,000 were spent at Paris in 1867, but on that occasion the outlay was, according to general opinion, needlessly lavish.

It must also be remembered that the expenditure of the Government only constitutes a small portion of what may be considered the total expenditure on the Section, as all the costs except those of general administration and of the Fine Art Department are really borne by the individual exhibitors. In 1876 Sir Herbert Sandford made a careful inquiry as to the amounts expended by British exhibitors at Philadelphia. He found that the expenses incurred by about 600 exhibitors there amounted to $600,000, or an average of $1,000 each. The total expenditure, public and private, on the British Section at Chicago with about 800 exhibitors may therefore be estimated at over a million dollars. This amount is exclusive of the sums to be expended by the British colonies.

The total space occupied by Great Britain and the Colonies at Chicago will in all probability be more than 500,000 square feet, exceeding the amount occupied in Paris in 1878, viz., 360,000 square feet, the largest space ever before filled by the British Section at any exhibition. In Vienna 170,000 square feet were occupied, at Philadelphia 195,000, at Paris in 1889, 233,000. At Paris in 1889, Belgium occupied 120,000, the United States 113,000 square feet. No other country had more than 65,000.

Of the total area allotted to Great Britain and the Colonies at the Chicago Exhibition, it is probable that Great Britain alone will occupy about 300,000 square feet. While the remaining 200,000 will be occupied by contributions from the British Colonies, the great countries which, practically independent and

self-governing, lend, on such an occasion as the present, so much strength to the Empire, and enable it to hold a position that without such aid it could never pretend to occupy. This is an advantage which no other country possesses, and one of which we Britons may surely with some justice be proud. It is not very easy to ascertain accurately the way in which space was divided between the mother country and the Colonies in previous exhibitions. At Paris in 1889 the Colonies and India only took up 38,000 square feet of the total area of 230,000. At Philadelphia the proportion was very much larger, and the Colonies seem to have occupied more than a third of the whole space.

The principal contributions of Great Britain will be found in the following buildings: Fine Arts, Manufactures, Transportation, Agriculture, and Machinery. The exhibits in the Electricity Building and the Mines and Mining Building will probably not be numerous, while very little is likely to be sent to the Fisheries Building or to that for Horticulture.

There is every reason to believe that the pictures sent out from England will be thoroughly representative of the modern British School. This part of the work has been under the active superintendence of Sir Frederick Leighton, the President of the Royal Academy, who has taken great interest, and devoted much time and thought to it. Very few, if any, of our prominent living artists will not be represented, and the list of exhibitors already includes all the names best known to frequenters of English galleries. It may be worth noting that all the pictures shown will be the property of individual collectors or artists. The regulations of our National collections do not allow of any contributions from them. In this respect we are at a disadvantage as compared with other European countries.

After the Fine Arts, the most important British exhibits will naturally be found in the Manufactures Building. Pottery, furniture, jewellery, in fact all the applications of art to industry are well represented. Textile industries will make a creditable show, although here the effect of the tariff will certainly be felt. There will be many large and important contributions in the Department of Chemical Industry, and a good collection of sporting guns and rifles.

The classes included in the Department of Liberal Arts will be shown in the gallery of this building. We expect to have an

especially good collection of photographs, both professional and amateur; an interesting exhibit showing the growth and present condition of the modern newspaper; some fine maps, including contributions from the Ordnance Survey Office and from the Royal Geological Society; and some representative educational collections. Our fine art publishers will also contribute many important works to this department, and we shall have a select exhibit of scientific apparatus.

To the Transportation Building most of our great shipbuilding firms will send models of their work. The London & North Western Railway will send a locomotive engine and several carriages, to compare with similar exhibits from American and Canadian railways, and the Great Western will send what is now a relic of the past, one of its fine broad-gauge engines. We shall have a very large exhibit of bicycles and tricyles, which vehicles it appears are largely supplied by England to the States. As we do not export any raw products, we cannot expect, in the Agricultural Building, to compete even with our own colonies; but here our food industries will be fairly represented, though we shall be showing almost nothing in the way of agricultural implements.

Our machinery section will certainly suffer from the effects of the tariff and from the severe competition of American makers, although I am glad to be able to say that the machinery which will be sent over from Great Britain will be of a high class, and, for the most part, of an entirely novel character.

The contributions which have been prepared for the Women's Building by a committee of English ladies, presided over by Her Royal Highness Princess Christian, will be of a specially interesting character. Of these the nursing exhibit promises to be the most important. A special room has been most kindly granted for it by the Committee of Lady Managers, and we on this side hope it may prove not unworthy to be placed side by side with what will certainly be the magnificent exhibits of like sort now being prepared in the States themselves. The work of English women in painting, literature, lace, embroidery, decoration, etc., will also be adequately represented.

Among the Colonies the largest contributor will be Canada, which will fill about 70,000 square feet. New South Wales also promises extensive contributions and has obtained a space of over 50,000 square feet. Ceylon has been allotted about 20,000,

the Cape a little over 4,000, and Jamaica about the same. The other Colonies are on a smaller scale; they include British Guiana, Mauritius, Trinidad, British Honduras, Bahama, Barbadoes, Windward Islands, Bermuda and the Leeward Islands.

India, I am sorry to say, has only an area of 3,000 square feet in the buildings, a space very incommensurate with her importance, but it will be used to the best advantage for a fine display of her art ware. Canada will show in most of the buildings. The principal contributions of New South Wales will be minerals and wool. From the Cape a fine diamond exhibit may be looked for. Ceylon will show tea and precious stones.

For the offices and headquarters of the British Commission, Colonel Edis, the Honorary Architect to the Commission, has designed a sixteenth-century house, half timber above, brick and terra-cotta in the lower story. In compliment to Her Majesty, and by her express permission, the building has been named the Victoria House. The accommodation provided, besides offices, will include reception rooms, and it is hoped that English visitors to Chicago during the summer may find here a convenient centre.

Besides the Victoria House there will be several other buildings on the grounds. These will include one or more typical Ceylon buildings for the exhibition of Ceylon products and the sale of Ceylon tea and I hope at all events one similar building from India.

In the south-east portion of the grounds, a building is being erected for a working dairy similar to those which proved such interesting features at several of the London exhibitions, and in Paris in 1889. A kiosk will be built by the White Star Line, and a reproduction of Shakespeare's House by the *Illustrated London News*.

HENRY TRUEMAN WOOD.

II. THE FRENCH SECTION.

BY THEODORE STANTON, COMMISSIONER RESIDENT IN PARIS.

THE French display at Chicago may be divided into five sections, viz.: (1) the General Exhibit; (2) Fine Arts; (3) the Colonial Exhibit; (4) Woman's Work; (5) Social Economy.

The general exhibit, which covers the usual field embraced in International Fairs—agriculture, mines, machinery, manufac-

tures, electricity, public instruction, etc.—will be large and brilliant. The space in the building for Manufactures and Liberal Arts allotted to France was long ago far more than filled; and in the other buildings also France will make a very creditable show. Some months ago some forty different committees were constituted at Paris, whose members are the most distinguished specialists of the country; and these committees are zealously and methodically organizing the future exhibits of France.

But *the* feature of the French exhibit will be the fine arts section. M. Roger-Ballu, the French Art Commissioner for Chicago, writes me: "I am confident of the high value of our art exhibit. All of our artists, regardless of the distance which their works must traverse, have responded to our appeal with such eagerness that we have had to check their ardor. The administration, at the request of the jury, has had to limit each painter to three canvases. Our contemporary sculptors will be nobly represented, and the same thing may be said of the departments of engraving and architecture. The casts for the exhibition, which are being made in our museums, will enable visitors to Chicago to obtain an admirable idea of the glorious past of our French sculpture.

"Our best representatives of decorative art have also insisted on the honor of being permitted to display specimens of our national taste in this department. Never before in the history of French art exhibitions has decorative art participated in the same exhibition on an equality with the products of plastic art and those of pure imagination. At Chicago France will proclaim for the first time in a World's Fair the principle that the words 'industrial art,' and 'decorative art,' are only prenomens and that the word 'Art' is the family name."

Almost the whole of the eastern annex of the Fine Arts Building will be given up to France. The large gallery near the main portion of the building will be hung with the works of French masters loaned by the public and private collections in the United States. The French art section proper will consist of about five hundred canvases, one hundred and fifty engravings, one hundred and fifty drawings, water colors, etc., perhaps a hundred architectural designs, about the same number of pieces of sculpture, and the large collection of plaster casts, referred to above by M. Roger-Ballu and copies of many of the objects belonging to the

great Paris State Museums, which represent every epoch of French art from the eleventh to the nineteenth century. To these must be added the specimens of decorative art, and the valuable collections of porcelain sent by the celebrated State manufactories of Sèvres, Beauvais and the Gobelins. "Thus will be attained the aim of the organizers of our art exhibit," M. Antonin Proust writes me, "to form a well-balanced *ensemble* of French art in all its manifestations."

The French colonial section will probably be one of the most popular at Chicago, and is sure to be exceedingly picturesque. The Algerian and Tunisian exhibits will be displayed in part in the Agricultural Building and in part on the lake near the Live Stock Buildings. Two original and very pretty structures will be erected there by M. Maurice Yvon, the French architect, and son of the well-known painter of that name. The first of these will be a Moresque pavilion covering a surface of over four hundred square yards. The central *patio* will be surrounded by porticoes in the form of Tunisian arcades. These porticoes and the *patio* itself will be used for the display of exhibits.

On either side of this pavilion will be constructed *souks*, sheds open to the view, where native artisans can be seen at work making Moresque jewelry, pipes, slippers, etc., which will then be placed on sale. The whole pavilion will be surrounded by a sort of pent house covered with green tiles, and will be a faithful copy of that striking Moresque style of architecture, so rich and original, of which such fine specimens are to be found in the African possessions of France.

In this pavilion will be grouped the products of Algeria and Tunis, such as cork, olive oil, figs, dates, almonds, and particularly wines. "The Algerian and Tunisian wines," writes Mr. Henrique, who has charge of the Colonial exhibit, "already enjoy a high reputation; but it is believed that the day is not far distant when they will become a still more formidable rival of the wines of Southern Europe." Among the African vineyards that will be represented at Chicago not a few, it is curious to note, are owned by Arabs; for, notwithstanding the Prophet's formal prohibition concerning wine, the number of Mohammedan wine-growers is increasing every year.

The second building to be erected by the Colonial section is

the Annamite Pavilion, which will cover an area of over two hundred square yards. It will consist of one grand central room with a ceiling of richly sculptured native wood. Statues of Buddha will flank the side entrances. The roof, which will be covered with Annamese tiles, will have a ridge of colored *faïence* on which are depicted chimeras, dragons, and other pagan monsters. This, it is believed, will be the first Annamite pagoda ever seen in the United States.

Around these two structures an Algerian garden will be laid out containing North African flora. The principal French colonies that will contribute to the exhibits displayed in these pavilions are, besides Algeria and Tunis, Martinique, Guadaloupe, Guyana, Congo, New Caledonia, Tahiti, and French India. They will be represented by from six to seven hundred exhibitors, who will send the most diverse products. Thus from Indo-China (Annam, Cambodia, Cochin China, and Tonkin) will come silk embroidered tapestries, inlaid furniture, rice, tea, and coal; from the Pacific dependencies, beautiful specimens of mother-of-pearl and of New Caledonian nickel; and from the Antilles, sugar, rum, tobacco, coffee, etc.

The social economy exhibit at Chicago will be a *résumé* of the one which attracted so much attention from the thoughtful visitors to the Paris Exposition of 1889. "The aim of the organizers of this exhibit," M. Lami, the active secretary of the committee, writes me, "is to show that in the field of social science France means to retain the high rank which she has always held." The number of exhibitors is quite large, notwithstanding the fact that many of them are charitable societies of one kind or another with very small incomes.

Besides these societies, several large French manufacturers have decided to make an exhibit of the *ensemble* of the various institutions which they have created for the purpose of ameliorating the moral and material condition of their workpeople. "In 1889 we found it difficult," M. Lami continues, "to make plain to the eye attempts to better the situation of our laboring classes; it seemed impossible to exhibit ideas. But since then we have found a way to render them tangible—we have had recourse to graphic charts. So we intend sending to Chicago large tables tastefully executed, which will enable the visitor to perceive at a glance the advantages resulting from the benevolent institutions

founded by far-seeing capitalists, economists and philanthropists—such, for instance, as coöperative societies, arrangements by which the workman participates in the profits; cheap houses for laborers, benevolent societies, etc."

The woman's exhibit will consist of beautiful laces and fans, ancient and modern; artificial flowers, specimens of fine linen, several examples of decorative art, Sèvres vases, embroidery, fancy work, some panels by Mme. Lervoudier, and specimens of the art work of the chief feminine artists of France, such as Mme. Léon Bertaux, the sculptor, and Mesdames Jehanne Mazeline, Madeleine Lemaire, Demont-Breton, Rougier, Louise Abbema, and other painters. Books written by women and documents concerning charities for, or directed by, women will also be exhibited. "We intend to show," the secretary of the committee writes me, "that the French woman, in every condition of life, from the lowest station to the highest, is an active, intelligent, hardworking member of society, who, when necessary, is able to support herself, and who, when blessed with fortune and leisure, displays an artistic and literary intelligence of a high order."

The Woman's Committee is made up of a body of able and distinguished ladies, with the wife of President Carnot at their head. Several meetings of this committee have been held in the Elysée Palace, under the presidency of Mme. Carnot, and the members are divided into a number of sub-committees that are harmoniously working with much ardor. It is safe to predict, therefore, that the French feminine exhibit in the Woman's Building and in the other departments of the Fair will be not inferior, at least, to those of tho other European countries.

A word remains to be said of two or three other features of the French exhibit. Tha series of international concerts, organized for the summer of 1893 by Mr. Theodore Thomas, will call to Chicago one or two of the leading French composers. Mr. George H. Wilson, Secretary of the Musical Department of the Exposition, has already secured the promised presence of M. Camille Saint-Saëns, and it is hoped that M. Massenet will also accept the invitation which has been extended to him.

Several important French contributions will be made to the United States government exhibit, organized by Mr. William E. Curtis of the State Department. Thus, Count Rosellely de Lorgnes, the biographer of Columbus, sends a photograph of a

rare portrait of the discoverer, while the Duke de Talleyrand lends the original of another famous Columbus portrait.* A copy of the celebrated Behaim terrestrial globe is being made at the Paris National Library under the direction of Mr. Henry Vignaud.

And last, but by no means least, is the contribution to the department of fine arts made by the American artists residing in France. If I am not mistaken, these Franco-American pictures and sculptures are to be placed next to those of France in the Gallery of Fine Arts in Jackson Park, in order to mark the close connection between master and pupil and to show that this American school is only an off-shoot of the great French school. Hence it is that I mention here, with a word, the fine arts exhibit of the American painters and sculptors of France.

Mr. Charles Sprague Pearce, the well-known artist, and President of the Paris American Jury, writes me as follows: "I think the American artists here will make a very good exhibit. Of course, many of the works which will be sent to Chicago are known already. But there are also many new ones. The limited amount of space at our disposal has made it necessary for the jury to set aside several very meritorious works. But the same thing is true in the case of the foreign art sections. Many French artists, who enjoy an international reputation, and who wished to send eight or ten works, have had to content themselves with two. So we cannot complain of our lot. The collection as a whole is very good and some of the productions are truly remarkable." It will consist of about one hundred and thirty oil paintings, six water colors, nine pastels, one group of architectural drawings, one group of etchings and about fifteen pieces of sculpture.

THEODORE STANTON.

* This portrait was accompanied by the following letter from the Duke, addressed to the chargé d'affaires of the American Legation in Paris, Mr. Henry Vignaud: "During the long years of my childhood and youth spent with my uncle, Prince de Talleyrand, I often heard him speak with gratitude of the warm reception accorded him by several families, during the sojourn which he made in America at the end of the last century. He used to speak with much feeling of the ties of friendship which united him with Colonel Hamilton, one of the founders of the grand republic. These recollections, which are still fresh in my mind, are an additional reason why I am willing to grant the request of your Government."

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

MISTAKES—BUT NOT OF MOSES.

THE November number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW contained an article from the pen of Col. R. G. Ingersoll, entitled "Ernest Renan," in which there is not a single quotation from the Bible that is correctly made. As a sample I submit the following:

Ingersoll: "It is asserted by Christians that the Ten Commandments are the foundation of all law . . . and before that time the world was without knowledge of justice or mercy. . . . Consequently before that time there had been proclaimed no law against the worship of other gods or idols. . . . Moses had been on the mountain talking with Jehovah . . . started down with the tables containing the ten commandments . . . heard music and dancing . . . saw the golden calf . . . got angry and broke the tables of stone and prepared to punish the Jews. . . . Remember that they knew nothing about this law and could not have known that it was wrong for them to worship idols, and yet Moses killed about thirty thousand of these people for having violated a law of which they had never heard; a law known to only one man and one God. Nothing could be more unjust, more ferocious than this."

Turn to the Bible:

Exodus xix, 3: Moses goes up into the mountain.

7—8: Moses returns and tells the people what God had said and the people pledge to obey.

9: Moses goes to the mountain again.

14: Moses returns and tells the people what God said.

19: Moses talks with God in the presence of the people.

20: Moses goes back to the mountain.

25: Moses goes down and tells the people what God said.

Exodus xx: Moses in the mountain receives the Ten Commandments.

Exodus xxi—xxii—xxiii: Moses in the mountain receives all the laws for governing the Israelites.

Exodus xxiv, 3: "And Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord and all the judgments; and all the people answered with one voice and said all the words which the Lord hath spoken will we do."

4: "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord."

5—6: A great feast prepared and a covenant entered into with God.

7: Moses reads to all the people what he had written, and all the people covenant to do all that the Lord had said.

The people had now received the Ten Commandments and all the other laws given by God to Moses, and had pledged to obey. Let us proceed:

Exodus xxiv, 12: God calls Moses up into the mountain again.

13: Moses and Joshua go up into the mountain and remain there forty days and nights. In this interview God is giving Moses instructions as to how the Tabernacle shall be built, furnished etc., as well as how the priests shall be appointed.

Exodus xxxi, 18: "God gave to Moses two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God."

Exodus xxxii, 1: Aaron and the people fashion the golden calf.

15: Moses and Joshua go down the mountain.
19: Moses breaks the tables of stone.
28: Moses killed about three thousand.

Let us now condense the comparison:

Ingersoll: "Moses killed about thirty thousand of these people for violating a law of which they had never heard; a law known to only one man and one God."

The Bible: Moses killed about three thousand for deliberately rebelling against God, forgetting all his mercies, and violating the laws which had lately been given to them, and breaking a solemn covenant which they had taken within forty days. Moses simply applied a law which is repeated in the New Testament: "If we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth a certain fearful expectation of judgment to come."

Further comment is unnecessary. Colonel Ingersoll's other quotations are as false as the one we have here given. I would recommend him to "search the Scriptures."

CHARLES W. TRICKETT.

SCIENCE AND THE WOMAN'S QUESTION.

THE claim of equal rights for women has been attacked from various points of vantage. We have had the æsthetic argument, the religious argument, the philosophical argument, and the political argument. Yet all these are merely beatings about the bush—they do not touch the kernel of the subject. They are, moreover, as unworthy of reply as were the opponents whom Frederick the Great meant when he uttered the apothegm in military tactics: "Never haggle with the enemy's light infantry."

If there be any real enemy of woman's rights, as it is called, that enemy is certainly not æsthetics, not religion, not philosophy, not politics, but science; it is the scientific field alone from which the claim can be attacked, if at all. Is science, then, our enemy, and are we women to meet it forever with the cry of *Ecrasez l'infame*? I deny that we are in any such danger. I propose even to show that, instead of being hostile to the claim which women make of equality with man, science is in its favor and has already placed it, for those who look deeply enough, upon an impregnable basis. I approach the subject, moreover, not in the timid belief that our modern women have overstated their case, but in the conviction that they have not yet fully realized its overwhelming strength.

It will be admitted, I think, that there is no inferiority in sex *per se*, and that least of all can such inferiority be laid at the door of the maternal function. Biology teaches that sex is a differentiation in the interest of the species—an unlikeness wrought partly by and partly for those complementary functions on which the perpetuation of the kind in the higher organisms has come to depend. It is not that to the masculine sex superior tasks have been assigned, and to the feminine inferior, but it is that there has been a division of functions simultaneously with structural differentiation for the performance of those functions. So that if nature has withdrawn from woman those ruder capacities for active life that have been conferred upon man, she has *en revanche* given to the more delicate sex that function which is not exceeded in its importance by any capacity exercised by men, namely, the work of bearing and rearing the new generation.

If, then, sex means simply division of labor, and not subordination of man to woman, or of woman to man, whence came the disabilities under which women have suffered in the past, and how, if they are still to be the

mothers, the child-rearers, the home-keepers of the race, do they look forward to the complete removal of these disabilities? We shall prepare ourselves for the reply to this question if we bear in mind that the so-called inequality of woman in the past has been no real inferiority, but merely a temporary subordination due to the maternal function, and to the relation of that function to social conditions. We shall find, moreover, at the very threshold of our inquiry, that the extent to which the function of motherhood absorbs the energies of woman has varied with the social state; that improvement of such state has set free for non-maternal activities an ever-increasing amount of such energies, and that woman reaches the true expression of her equality with man just as fast as the race becomes civilized.

Sociologists are agreed that the position of woman, even as a mother, has been largely determined by the stage of development reached by society. Generally speaking, the militant condition goes hand in hand with the subjection of women; in other words, where the tribal group or nation is constantly engaged in the activities of war, there the mothers must occupy an inferior position, and must undergo all the disabilities of that position. It is not that in the fighting stage women are oppressed by men, but it is that both men and women have their status determined by the character of the prevailing civilization. On the other hand, progress from the militant to the industrial type of society is, generally speaking, accompanied by the gradual emancipation of women from such subjection, and the gradual recognition of her equality with man.

Let us now consider in detail the various ways in which advancing civilization brings about this important change in the status of women. There is first of all a decrease in the birth rate. It is a biological law from the operation of which even self-conscious man is not excepted, that the rate of reproduction is adjusted so as to maintain the species. Where a tribe or nation is constantly at war, there will be little or no check upon multiplication, and the burdens of motherhood will be many and severe. Where, on the contrary, the peaceful state of society has been ushered in, the demand for new individuals to maintain the kind will fall to its minimum, the natural checks upon multiplication will come into play, and woman will be relieved of some of the exhausting labors of child-bearing and child-rearing. The various developments, moreover, which civilization brings in its train—such as sanitary improvements, discoveries in the medical and surgical arts, inventions of all kinds, and all perfecting of the methods of living—tend powerfully to make life more lasting and secure; to increase the chances of the survival of all the children born, and thus help on the emancipation of women. All social progress, in fact, furnishes illustrations of the Spencerian formula that "advancing evolution is accompanied by declining fertility," that "genesis decreases as individuation increases."

The passing away of international warfare not only relaxes the subordination of woman in the way indicated, but sets free some of the energies of the mother for activities other than those which are maternal and domestic. Simultaneously with the advent of the industrial state and the diversion of minds from the acts of war to those of peace, there come numerous occupations in which women find it possible to engage. The new social condition, in fact, works a complete change in the attitude of women towards extra-domestic employments. In a fighting state they are compelled to regard marriage as their only means of livelihood, and this is still true of the great

majority of women in the militant societies of Europe; but in the industrial state they cease to be thus limited. There is the further result that non-militant, industrial life gives woman those opportunities of mental development which ages of exclusive subjection to the duties of the household have denied her. In the industrial field, under the freer conditions of the non-militant state, she has already—in the United States, for example—utilized these opportunities in the development, not only of great industrial expertness, but also of remarkable intellectual power.

But there are some who, while generally favorable to the cause of women, will be inclined to doubt whether the biological truths which justify them in entering into occupations once reserved exclusively for the men entitle the gentler sex to equality also in political privileges—whether, in a word, the claim of women to the suffrage is the equally natural and inevitable outcome of the evolutionary process.

Mr. Spencer ("Justice," p. 166) denies the voting privilege to women on the ground that they cannot fight. "Unless, therefore," says he, "women furnish contingents to the army and navy such as men furnish, it is manifest that, ethically considered, the question of the equal 'political rights,' so called, of women cannot be entertained until there is reached a state of permanent peace." Now, Mr. Spencer, by implying that men will continue to vote even in a state of permanent peace, shows that the price which they pay for the voting privilege is to be demanded only during the continuance of international antagonisms. It is to be noted, moreover, that even in the case of men, and during the continuance of militant conditions, the duty is not either an absolute or an inevitable one. Just as certain persons are exempted by law from serving on juries, etc., while retaining the privilege of voting, so men may be exempt from military duty in time of war without losing their right to the suffrage. If it be claimed that all women could not find substitutes, the fact that some men can is sufficient to deprive Mr. Spencer's rule of that universal validity on which its argumentative value so obviously depends. Yet this aspect of the question may be altogether waived in view of the circumstance that women even now perform a service of much more importance to the race than the service of bearing arms. They bear children. And if it is to be urged that, because women do not imperil their lives as soldiers they are not entitled to equal political privileges, it may with like justice be argued that, because men do not pass through the perils of child-birth, they ought to be denied the privilege of voting.

In reality, women do "furnish contingents" to the army and navy, and furnish them at the peril of their lives. At the same church service in time of war you may hear the prayer for women in travail and for the army on the field. So that, in his haste to discover some things which men do of which women are incapable, Mr. Spencer has overlooked one function, of pre-eminent importance for the race, in the discharge of which women naturally excel, but for which men have hitherto not shown the slightest capacity. If, then, women have no right to vote, it is certainly not because they cannot become soldiers, for this logic would deprive men of the suffrage on the ground that they cannot bear children.

But Mr. Spencer, half conscious of the weakness of his position, urges that woman cannot be intrusted with a vote on the additional ground that she is emotional, a worshipper of power, and not judicially minded. This is on a par with the argument made by the anti-abolitionists that the slave could not be safely intrusted with his freedom; for just as the very quali-

ties which had been produced by slavery were invoked to prove the incapacity of the colored race for freedom, so the feminine qualities that have been wrought by centuries of the subjection of women are to-day used as an argument why that subjection should continue.

I have thus sought to show—more by the suggestion of an argument than by any detailed elaboration of it—that the subjection of women in the past has been due, not to any natural inferiority of women, but primarily to the absorption of their energies by the maternal function, and secondarily to the social condition determining the degree of the exercise of that function. But I have also claimed that, with the improvement of the social state, setting free more and more of the energies of woman for other than purely domestic activities, and making possible her mental and physical adaptation to such activities, there has come, by a perfectly natural and necessary process, that change in the position of woman which even in its incomplete stage we are accustomed to call her emancipation.

I would finally urge that the claim made in these days of woman's equality with man is simply the expression and outcome of that revised meaning which modern life is giving to the function of maternity, and I hold that the movement thus begun, and so manifestly sanctioned by the evolutionary process, will be carried on to a sure and complete triumph, not by the generosity of men, and not by the advocacy of women, but by the whole of the influences that tend to improve the social state—in a word, by ever-advancing civilization. It is not that the woman of the future will cease to be a mother, but that motherhood will grow less and less arduous, and that its past disabilities will diminish until they finally disappear. The great problem of the age—how to emancipate women and preserve motherhood—is already more than half solved. The world has no longer need of the enormous sacrifices through which our sex has replenished the race in the past; the black eras of strife and cruelty are gone, and in the perfect social order which is coming, woman is to do something more than to suffer and toil—something more than to furnish her contingents to the industrial armies and navies of the world. She is to live.

LYDIA LVOVNA PIMENOFF.

FROM RENAN'S POINT OF VIEW.

"THERE does seem to be little that is even intellectually satisfying," writes John Fiske, the eminent evolutionist, "in the awful picture which science shows us, of giant worlds concentrating out of nebulous vapor, developing with prodigious waste of energy into theatres of all that is grand and sacred in spiritual endeavor, clashing and exploding again into dead vapor balls, only to renew the same toilful process without end,—a senseless bubble-play of Titan forces, with life, love, and aspiration brought forth only to be extinguished. The human mind, however 'scientific' its training, must often recoil from the conclusion that this is all; and there are moments when one passionately feels that this cannot be all. On warm June mornings in green country lanes, with sweet pine odors wafted in the breeze which sighs through the branches, and cloud shadows flitting over far-off blue mountains, while little birds sing their love songs, and golden-haired children weave garlands of wild roses; or when in the solemn twilight we listen to wondrous harmonies of Beethoven and Chopin that stir the heart like voices from an unseen world; at such times one feels that the profound-

est answer which science can give to our questionings is but a superficial answer after all. At these moments, when the world is fullest of beauty, one feels most strongly that it is but the harbinger of something else,—that the ceaseless play of phenomena is no mere sport of Titans, but an orderly scene, with its reason for existing, its

'One divine far-off event,
To which the whole creation moves.'

"Difficult as it is to disentangle the elements of reasoning that enter into these complex groups of feeling, one may still see, I think, that it is speculative interest in the world, rather than anxious interest in self, that predominates. The desire for immortality in its lowest phase is merely the outcome of the repugnance we feel towards thinking of the final cessation of vigorous activity. Such a feeling is naturally strong with healthy people. But in the mood which I have tried to depict, this feeling, or any other which is merely self-regarding, is lost sight of in the feeling which associates a future life with some solution of the burdensome problem of existence."

The thought which Mr. Fiske puts thus strongly and clearly—the repugnance to acknowledging as possible, quite apart from the question of personal immortality, so purposeless a career for the universe, with so much in it of dramatic suggestion—is a thought that to the average mind seems accentuated by the discoveries of modern science. The unity of nature, in substance and process, as revealed by these discoveries, impresses such a mind as having a distinctly teleological bearing. If through a wonderfully sensitive although impalpable luminiferous ether "every part of the universe shares in the life of all the other parts"; if the most distant stars show the same chemical composition as our own little abode called Earth; if everywhere we find evidence that the process of world-making is the same, by a similar development out of nebulous vapor;—the conclusion that universal unity has a teleological significance is for the average mind immensely strengthened. Put over against this significance Mr. Fiske's eternal see-saw of development and destruction as the "superficial" interpretation by science of this purposeless universe, and the instinct of revolt against so ignoble and unworthy, not to say monstrous, an interpretation is infinitely intensified.

Given a man of unfaltering loyalty to the conclusions of science wherever they may lead him; a man of unreserved agnosticism so far at least as the record of his writings commits him; a man of so powerful a scientific imagination that, it has been said, he anticipated Darwin and Spencer; a man whose literary genius was poetical in its warmth and glow; a man who lived in history and made it live; a man of charming personality, to whom mere existing was a perpetual source of interest and pleasure—in short, a man who is a wonderful combination of scientific imagination, literary art, scholarly training, historical insight, and individual optimism, and confront him with the "intellectually unsatisfying" picture of the tendencies of phenomena as seen by the light of science, and what has M. Renan to offer of suggestion or hope?

The answer is a curious one, and is given in an article contributed to the *Revue des Deux Mondes* a great many years ago. This answer is condensed by E. P. Whipple in an essay on "Religion and Scientific Theories," where it is referred to as an article "of which Renan's admirers equally with his adversaries seem to be strangely ignorant." Mr. Whipple in summarizing Renan's article thus gives its substance: "Science shows that, in the

slow but sure operation of natural laws, the solar system must be destroyed. A million years is a comparatively short period in the figures of astronomy. If scientific men have during the past hundred and fifty years made such enormous advances in the discovery, control, and application of the forces of Nature, why should they not, in the course of a million years, contrive to arrest the seeming tendency of our solar system to self-destruction? In a century and a half much has been done; what may not be done in ten thousand centuries in a 'square fight' of the quick faculties of mind against the slow operations of matter? Our foremost men of science are mere babes in knowledge, as well as in power, compared to the men who will rise in the next thousand years, if science and invention go on at their present continually accelerated pace. Why, on this principle, should not man at the end of a million years obtain control of the whole solar system?'

The seriousness with which John Fiske draws the gloomy picture, has been purposely put first to heighten the contrast to this flippant, almost jaunty, and typically French, suggestion of a possibility of escape. Its obvious inadequacy in concerning itself only with the little corner of the universe in which man is directly interested, when the sweep of those great apparent tendencies stops not short of the farthest bounds which science can discern, need not be commented on. The whole suggestion is so fanciful and airy while appealing to a scientific possibility for basis, is so ingenious and audacious yet unreal in substance, as to affect one like a bit out of one of Jules Verne's stories, It indeed seemingly places mind above matter, yet it really places the soul below matter—a refinement of materialism. For its suggestion goes no deeper than the problem of continuing the material universe, and ignores all the inner questionings and inspirations that lend to the universe a fitting dramatic purpose.

If it be simply a question of averting the apparent crushing of the empty shell there is but little in M. Renan's suggestion beyond flattery of man's puny powers—a flattery that is, even if true, a mockery. What remains but the apostrophe of Henley, apostle of modern pessimism:

> "Maker and breaker,
> I am the ebb and the flood
> Here and Hereafter.
> Sped through the tangle and coil
> Of infinite nature,
> Viewless and soundless I fashion all being.
> Taker and Giver,
> I am the womb and the grave,
> The Now and the Ever."

The attitude of a gifted mind towards the sum of phenomena, as if mere greatness and vastness argued a difference in kind and not of degree, is largely determined by the predominating influence of an age. At times it may lead to an exaggeration of man's greatness, at times to an exaggeration of his littleness. Green, the historian, points out that the spirit of the last quarter of the sixteenth century, culminating in its wonderful display of intellectual activity in learning, literature and travel, so dominated Shakespeare that mere theological questions had for him no apparent interest. So absorbed was the great master in Man, in the infinite variety of his character and power, that Man's relation to the universe seemed merely incidental.

By the reverse of this, one—like Renan,—dominated by the scientific

spirit of the age, may indeed originate an audaciously brilliant and ingenious theory of the power that science may confer on Man—a theory that seems to raise him to the position of a god in one of the old mythologies. But by laying the stress on what Man can do, rather than on what Man is, such a theory really dishonors him, offering no further basis for a belief in "the reasonableness of the universe," without which all speculation is materialism, gloss it over as one may. It leaves out of account "life, love and aspiration," which alone ennoble existence in a universe, however grand its phenomena, or vast its extent, or perfect its harmony.

This contrast between the philosophy which contents itself with mere phenomena, and the philosophy which sees in man the greatest phenomenon of all, and pries into the secrets of existence, is as old as the ancients. Thus Seneca, as translated by quaint Thomas Lodge, writes to Lucillius of a broad spirit of research: "This is the more high and courageous; it giveth itself a larger scope, and not content with that which she discovereth by the eyes, suspecteth that there is somewhat more greater and more fairer, which Nature hath locked from our sight."

ARTHUR REED KIMBALL.

THE AMERICAN COMMON SCHOOLS.

DANGERS threatening the common schools in this republic, arising from religious controversy, have from time to time appeared, and in most instances have been happily and successfully averted.

The principal assaults, and they have recently taken on great boldness, have been in the direction of demands for the division of the school fund on denominational lines, in order that systematic sectarian religious instruction might be given at the expense of the State. But these demands cannot be assented to without annihilating the common school system, and without the destruction of the conceded American principle of the complete separation of Church and State.

The legal status of the common school in each State, from both the secular and the religious standpoint, is dependent upon that State's constitution and legislative enactments. There are in these interests certain fundamental principles common to the entire country, certain uniform laws bearing upon the common-school system, giving it a kind of autonomy, and, so to speak, establishing a non-partisan and unsectarian republic of letters within the body politic.

The people dividing as they will into religious sects, the individual interests of each sect must be advanced by its own effort and at its own cost. The common-school system uninterrupted and honestly worked has all the power necessary to the attainment of its conceded and legitimate purpose, and that is, to largely promote the well-being of the State through an intelligent and moral citizenship.

Deriving from the people the means for its support, it has legal authority and accountability and moral responsibility. Supported by all, and free to all, there must be nothing about it to which any unprejudiced citizen of the republic can rationally object, and each must use it so as not to interfere with the rights and duties of others.

The governmental power which assesses and collects taxes cannot be employed to promote or repress the interest of any secular or religious section of the citizenship, or for any purpose less than the impartial and highest good of all. Religious education belonging primarily to the family and

the Church, the State, guaranteeing religious liberty, permits all denominations who desire to do so to establish church schools, colleges, and seminaries at their own expense.

The State cannot oblige the Church to teach the rights and needs and duties of citizenship. This obligation involves both the rights of the child and of the State, and rests largely upon the parent. The State can compel the performance of this obligation and can secure these rights by the enactment and enforcement of compulsory laws, binding upon parents and guardians, as the condition of the free existence of civil and religious liberty. If the Church pretends in its schools to give the education that the State rightfully requires, then the State must know the fact by having supervisory access to these schools. When the limits of Church and State authority in matters of education are properly defined, in accord with the purpose and spirit of republican institutions, and when by each their normal and legitimate work is honestly performed, harmony will ensue. The American people will secure this result even if they are compelled to conquer a peace, and make that peace perpetual by constitutional entrenchments.

Compulsory education laws are presupposed in the right of a people to govern themselves. Such laws are only opposed in this country by those who would employ ecclesiastical compulsion to secure attendance on sectarian schools. We trust the day is not far distant when the scope of education which the State has right to require in its common schools will be definitely and uniformly determined, and the debate concerning the attitude of the State towards church schools and concerning the opposition to state schools and to compulsory laws and their enforcement will be ended. But in this debate the State will assuredly insist upon its right and duty to secure for its youthful citizens efficient elementary education, including the history and laws of the country.

Whenever the issue is raised, the great majority of our thoughtful, patriotic citizens will be found tenaciously adhering to substantially the following platform of purposes and principles concerning the American free common school system :

A knowledge of the exact situation by all intelligent citizens, all genuine Americans native born and naturalized, in every community, resolving themselves into a committee of the whole, to jealously watch and loyally guard these nurseries of our citizenship, and whenever they are assaulted conducting the defence without malice, without bigotry, without fear, without compromise.

An honest recognition of the commendable features of our school system.

An equally honest recognition of the defects, with willingness to learn from any and all other systems, which, in any of their features, may suggest needed improvements.

A readiness to face the patent defects, not attempting to cover but to courageously conquer them.

The best and most thorough instruction in every department, moral, mental, industrial, physical, placing the system by its preëminence out of the field of anything approaching general competition.

Insist upon the absolute necessity of the precedence and mastery of the National language.

Require the careful training of all the children and youth in the fundamental political doctrines and moral axioms and principles on which the free American government rests, as the only adequate method of securing that respect for the opinions and circumstances of others, readily inculcated in youth but difficult to acquire when character has been shaped and determined.

Let the people see to it that the practice of economy for political purposes does

not commence in any community with the schools, but provide without prodigality and with liberality, for both school buildings and school support.

Let no political, or ecclesiastical or atheistical outcry, from whatever source against religious instruction in the schools be the means of banishing a high morality from the character of the teaching or from the qualifications of the teacher. The American idea is that the school shall be a civil educator to make good citizens, and good citizens must possess moral character. The schools will inevitably be a reflex of the noble, cultured, moral characters of the instructors.

Banish absolutely all sectarianism from the management and teaching of these public schools, and all evidence in the structures used, or in the garb of teachers, that would suggest sectarian relationship, or hint at the remotest connection of Church and State.

Let National, State, county and municipal treasuries be jealously guarded against all attempts or pretexts for the division of the sacred funds which they hold for the support of common schools.

Let all partisan political control be banished from the management of the schools.

Let wise and fair compulsory education laws be speedily perfected and judiciously enforced.

Let all schools, where citizens are being trained for the performance of their duties as sovereigns in the republic, come under the intelligent supervision of the governmental authorities, as a rightful measure of safety, and as the only method of approximating that practical uniformity of results essential to popular education in a republic. One of the principal functions of the common school is to Americanize the children of foreign birth or parentage, and by its processes of digestion and assimilation make them a healthful part of the body politic. Thus only can the dangerously heterogeneous be made safely homogeneous.

The American flag ought to float over every public-school building in the republic while the schools are in session, as an object-lesson in patriotism for childhood and youth, and as a symbol to the world that we consider these buildings the fortresses of our strength, from which go forth the forces which are the best protectors of our free institutions.

JAMES M. KING,
General Secretary, "The National League for the Protection of American Institutions."

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXXVI.

MARCH, 1893.

AMERICAN FARMING A HUNDRED YEARS HENCE.

BY THE HON. J. M. RUSK, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

WHAT farming will be a century hence may at first sight seem to be a matter of pure speculation; nevertheless, it deserves the most thoughtful consideration of those who take a patriotic interest in the future of the country with which the future of our agriculture is indissolubly bound.

To those who have the shaping of the country's destinies in their hands the future must be ever present. It is only the shallow, superficial or selfish man, never the statesman, who considers a subject affecting deeply the interests of his country solely from the standpoint of present expediency.

My recollections of farm life, with which I have always been closely, and at times exclusively, identified, go back over forty years, and retrospectively I can thus gather material upon which to predicate some of the changed conditions which will attend the growth of our country during the next century.

My boyhood was passed on a farm in what was then one of the Western States (Ohio), in the days of the flail and the old-fashioned plow; of spinning wheel and hand loom, and home-made clothing; when settlers migrated westward in "prairie schooners," and business and professional men travelling on business or for pleasure rode in the old-fashioned mail coach or on the canal boats; when the farmer's main object was to produce on his

Copyright, 1893, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

land what he needed for his own and his family's consumption, the home markets being scattered and foreign markets hardly accessible; when millionaires were unknown, and land was plentiful—so plentiful that the possibility of the exhaustion of the public domain in the lifetime of persons then living could not have been suggested without ridicule.

What changes have taken place since those days are patent to all who use their sight and hearing, and they may be readily divided into four classes:

(1.) Extent and character of our population.

(2.) Methods of farming.

(3.) Our trade relations, both interstate and international.

(4.) The conditions of rural life.

Our population has increased in the past fifty years from seventeen millions to over sixty-two millions, while the population of our cities has increased beyond all proportion to the general increase throughout the country. The age of steam and electricity, of speculation and monopolies, with opportunities for accumulation of wealth never before dreamed of, has drawn from the healthful, peaceful and reasonably prosperous occupation of agriculture many of the brainiest of our young Americans, and many who, without being exceptionally gifted, have yet been readily persuaded to abandon the certainty of moderate well-being in the country for the delusive chances of fortune in the cities. Their places have been largely taken by foreigners in many States, and the result has been that in its character, although not in ratio of increase, the farming population has changed as much as that of our cities. It is my opinion, however, that in diversity of character, the change in our agricultural population will be less marked in the future than in the past, and this for reasons which are set forth sufficiently in the following pages.

Should our population increase as rapidly during the coming hundred years as in the past fifty, it will be at the end of that period not less than four hundred millions. I think it will not so increase; for one thing, we will not have the same inducements to offer to immigrants. When the price of land goes up, as it is bound to do, and its acquisition requires more money; when more capital is required to undertake farming, except on the smallest scale, and truck farms near cities bring a high rent and call for the greatest intelligence as well as industry on the part of the

farmer, one of the chief inducements to foreigners to seek our shores, namely the acquisition of farms of their own, will disappear. At the same time the liberal tendencies of all civilized countries, even under monarchical governments, will lessen the number of those who leave the older countries for the sake of greater political freedom. Immigration to the United States will consist more and more of a few comparatively well-to-do persons, seeking opportunities for the profitable investment of a small capital, and who, possessing some education and training in the art of self-government, will readily amalgamate with our own people ; or of the poorest classes well content to serve for a time in the ranks of labor, provided the rate of wages is high enough to reward their frugality with moderate savings.

While recognizing thus the changes which are likely to occur in the character of the immigration to this country, I emphatically do not wish to be understood as opposing immigration. On the field of battle as on the field of labor, I have found immigrants from foreign shores doing their duty heroically and creditably, side by side with their fellow citizens of American birth. I am not insensible to the important part played by foreign immigrants in the wonderful development of our country during the past generation. It is not desirable to forbid immigration, though it is our duty to control it. I am ready now as ever to extend a welcome to every honest, hard-working man seeking our shores to better his condition, and to carve out a home for himself and his descendants in this land of promise. It is no offence that he is poor. Let us take precautions to exclude the criminal and pauper classes, the political maniacs who have declared themselves enemies of all society and government, and then, with a proper enforcement of our laws, so that every voter may recognize the full responsibilities of citizenship, we shall have done all that in my opinion is needed for the protection of our people and our institutions.

The most remarkable changes in the character of our agricultural population will be found in the occupation and the possession by private owners of every foot of land available for tillage. From semi-tropical Florida to the State of Washington, from the lakes and forests of Maine to the orange groves and vineyards of southern California, every acre of land, save what is absolutely untillable or necessarily devoted to

the forest and the mine, will be taxed to supply the needs of three, if not four, hundred millions of people, who will doubtless be then, as now, the wealthiest and least self-denying of any people in the world. More bushels of wheat will be needed to supply our own people with bread than our present average yield of corn, which means three and a half times more than last year's crop, the largest but one of any wheat crop ever harvested in the United States. Irrigation will be practised as a matter of course, wherever water is obtainable, and millions of acres now unproductive will yield rich harvests. American farmers will supply American consumers with half a billion dollars' worth of sugar, whether cane, sorghum, or beet; the demands of our home markets for meat and dairy products will be met by a system of care and feeding which will convert the now commonly accepted ratio of four acres to one cow into something more like four cows to one acre. Science, aided by necessity, will have solved the problems of feeding, so as to secure the maximum result for the minimum feed; waste products will be utilized in a hundred ways not now dreamed of, and we can readily realize that, besides the increased yield due to a better understanding of plant life and culture, and to the remedies for the prevention of the injuries, whether by disease or insects, whereby agriculture to-day loses hundreds of millions of dollars yearly, the application of every acre of our vast territory to the particular uses for which it is best adapted will add immensely to our aggregate productiveness.

What the worth of land will be in those days no man can venture to estimate; but of one thing we can all rest assured, and that is, that the richest inheritance a man can leave to his grandchildren and their immediate descendants will be a farm of many broad fertile acres in the United States of America.

It may not be uninteresting to point out a differentiation into classes among farmers, which I can readily see will gradually take place in this country, and which will have attained its full development before the period of which I write. Every large city already affects the method of farming in the country contiguous to it, and as this suburban land becomes more and more valuable every acre of it will be taxed to its utmost capacity to supply the needs and the luxuries of the city people. For these, glass houses will obliterate the seasons, and strawberries and lettuce in midwinter will no longer

occasion surprise. Such methods of tillage demand the best kind of labor and the constant, personal supervision of the owner or farmer himself, and this of necessity means farms of a few acres. On the other hand, the large farms will no longer be conducted by men who, with their own hands, feed the stock and milk the cows, and follow the plow or cultivate the corn. The exigencies of farm life in those days will tax all the brain power and business qualifications of a man whose life work will demand a better education, in the scientific branches at least, than that of the merchant or the banker, or even the lawyer. The man who farms a large farm successfully in 1993 must be such a man as would be successful in any career, whether professional or mercantile, and who, like the merchant or manufacturer, must command some capital, and be capable of utilizing profitably the labor of his fellows.

The natural evolution of agriculture, under its changed and changing conditions, involves a survival of the fittest, which will necessarily relegate poor farmers—I use the word "poor" in the intellectual sense—not, let us hope, and I truly believe, to the level of the English agricultural laborer, but to the condition of a thrifty peasantry, owning their own homes, with perhaps a few acres of land, but depending principally for support upon wages earned by laboring for others.

In my opinion, the changes in our methods of farming in the future will be brought about by a wide knowledge and application of scientific principles. I do not think it probable that farm implements will be improved very much, although doubtless on the larger farms means will be devised to perform certain operations by electricity or steam. Nor do I lay any stress upon the possible revolution in methods of farming anticipated by those who think that the rainfall may be controlled at will by explosives, a theory which will, long before the time of which I write, have been itself thoroughly exploded and given a place among the curiosities of so-called scientific investigation, in company with its twin absurdity, the flying machine. There will be some change in our methods, owing to a differentiation of farming purposes brought about by the demand for new products, and by the necessity, in order to make farming profitable, of providing for the home demand all that our soil and climate can produce, and by the devoting of certain sections, and even of certain farms, to those pro-

ducts for which they may be specially adapted. Such specialization will be rendered more and more easy as the cost, if not the difficulty, of transportation is reduced. Our means of transportation have been so greatly increased during the past twenty-five years that it is very difficult to imagine their being carried much further; but means will doubtless be found by which the cost of carriage may be greatly reduced, with corresponding facility and ease in transportation.

Our trade relations, probably, will not exercise so great an influence in the changes of the future as they have done in the past. Without in any degree sharing the melancholy forebodings of those who anticipate that a comparatively slight increase in our present population will compel the United States to become a large importer of food products such as our own soil produces, I am of the opinion that long before a hundred years have rolled by we will have ceased to export food products to foreign countries, with the exception of a few products in concentrated form. Our trade in farm products will hence be interstate, not international, and will be regulated by the growth of our population and the consequent extension of our home markets.

It is the conditions of rural life to which I look for the greatest change, amounting to a veritable transformation in the future of agriculture in this country. At first glance it may appear that I have underestimated the transformation which has taken place in those conditions during the period covered by my personal experience. It is unquestionably true that modern manufacturing methods have entirely destroyed such home industries as shoemaking, coopering, tailoring, spinning, weaving, etc., by which so many farmers in the first half of the century occupied their time and added to their modest incomes during the winter months. The farmer's grain is no longer carried to the mill in a sack thrown over a horse's back and kept in place as a saddle for the barefooted boy who, taking the grain to mill, brought back flour for domestic consumption. The old-fashioned bees, the husking and the corn-shelling, with their accompanying sociability and the customary dance, have become almost obsolete in many parts of the country, and with the exception of the South, where, in spite of the changes effected by the war and the abolition of slavery, matters seem to go on in the country districts very much as of yore, there are many features in

which farming life differs from that of forty years ago. The difference is not always, perhaps, in the line of improvement. But in the main, and in its most important features, I believe the conditions of rural life to have changed less in the past half century than the other features of farming to which I have referred; for, while farming implements have been practically revolutionized, while our methods of farming, as, for instance, in dairying, have undergone marked change, while our population has increased, and the trade in our agricultural products has developed beyond the most imaginative conceptions of the farmer of fifty years ago, many of the conditions of rural life, including, I am sorry to say, many of those which are its principal drawbacks, still remain. There is to-day almost the same isolation, for example, as compared with the life of town or city, the same unceasing round of labor, beginning with the dawn and scarce ending with the dark; our country roads are little, indeed, I may say, no better, and school and church facilities in the country districts are not much greater than they were. Now it is in these very conditions that I look for, perhaps, the most marked change to occur in the agricultural life of the future.

In the first place, the average size of our farms will be considerably less than now. There will be large farms, no doubt; but under such a modernized system of agriculture as will unquestionably prevail a hundred years hence, what will be a large farm then would not be regarded as a particularly large farm at the present day. Moreover, for reasons which I have already indicated, there will be a very much greater number of small farms than now, not only in the neighborhood of cities, but in all those sections where irrigation is practised. The result of this will be a greater concentration of population even in rural districts, and hence far less isolation than exists at present, and this isolation will be still further diminished by good, smooth, well-kept roads, bordered with handsome shade trees, and available for travel at all seasons. With such a dense population as we shall then have, electric motors will be established, without a doubt, along many of the principal roads, extending out several miles into the country from every town or city of any consequence. The telephone will be found in every farmhouse, and should the present Postmaster-General be privileged to revisit the scene of his earthly labors,

he will find his dream a reality, with a rural mail delivery which will carry mails daily to every farmhouse in the land. The residents in the country will vie in culture and education with the corresponding classes in the cities, while, with the disappearance of the many inconveniences which now prejudice the wealthy against country life, the business and professional men will look forward to the acquisition of wealth as a means for securing a home in the country, where they can end their days in peace and comfort. No one questions the healthfulness of country life, and its many advantages so far as physical well-being is concerned over the city, and when the country home is equal in comfort and culture to that of the city, no argument will be needed to prove its superiority to the latter.

It would take more eloquence than I have at my command to present to the reader a picture of agricultural life a hundred years from now as it exists in my mind, but I trust I have said enough to interest even those who are not directly concerned with agriculture in its future development, and to impress upon them the importance of giving to the agricultural interests due weight in all plans or legislation looking to the future prosperity of our great country.

It seems not inappropriate that I should take this occasion to emphasize the fact that the Department which represents agriculture in the national government is practically in its infancy. That it does render good service to agriculture there is no question, although the total appropriation for its support, some three million dollars, is considerably less than one per cent. of the aggregate appropriations made for the support of the national government. As the importance of agriculture becomes more and more appreciated by the whole people, and the large part it is destined to play in the development of our country is more widely recognized, it is reasonable to believe, and I personally have every expectation, that the National Department of Agriculture will become more and more liberally endowed, so that at the time of which I write the appropriations made for it, by comparison with those devoted to the other purposes of government, will be proportionate to its true position in relation to the other industries of the country.

J. M. Rusk.

THE SANDWICH ISLANDS.

I.—THE ADVANTAGES OF ANNEXATION.

BY LORRIN A. THURSTON, EX-PRIME MINISTER OF HAWAII AND CHAIRMAN OF THE HAWAIIAN ANNEXATION COMMISSION.

HAWAII is a small country; so small that it is represented on the average map by a few dots surrounded by crinkly lines; but height of stature and girth of waist are not the measure of the man, and Hawaii's importance is not based on breadth of acres, although, as a matter of fact, its area is five hundred square miles greater than the combined area of Connecticut and Rhode Island. Located as it is at the "Cross Roads of the Pacific," midway between San Francisco and Japan, and equidistant from nearly all the principal Pacific ports, Hawaii is the Key of the Western Ocean.

There has, until recently, been little to bring this fact to the attention of the average American citizen; but it has been recognized and acted upon by the most eminent American statesmen during the past sixty years. As years have passed and the policies of intervention and non-intervention with affairs beyond the limits of the Republic have alternately waxed and waned, one consistent and persistent policy has been pursued by the United States concerning Hawaii, viz: *That the preservation of the Hawaiian Islands from the domination or control of any other great nation is essential to the welfare of the United States.*

This policy was initiated by President John Quincy Adams in 1826, when the United States made a treaty with what was then little more than a breech-clouted nation of savages. It recognized the independence of Hawaii, and treated with her as an equal. This, the first treaty recognition, by any of the great powers,

of Hawaiian independence, has been followed by a succession of treaties, and declarations by American statesmen, all tending to the conclusion that the safety of the Pacific Coast and of American interests in the Pacific Ocean require that Hawaii be either American territory or an independent, neutral, friendly power.

In 1842, President Tyler, voicing also the sentiments of Secretary Webster, thus referred to Hawaii in his address to Congress:

"It cannot but be in conformity with the wishes of the Government and people of the United States that this community , . . should be respected, and all its rights strictly and conscientiously regarded; . . . while its nearer approach to this continent, and the intercourse which American vessels have with it. . . . could not but create dissatisfaction on the part of the United States at any attempt by another power to take possession of the islands. . . . Considering, therefore, that the United States possesses so very large a share of the intercourse with those islands, it is deemed not unfit to make the declaration that their Government seeks, nevertheless, no exclusive control over the Hawaiian Government, but is content with its independent existence, and anxiously wishes for its security and prosperity. Its forbearance in this respect, under the circumstances of the very large intercourse of their citizens with the islands, would justify this Government . . . in making a decided remonstrance against the adoption of an opposite policy by any other power."

President Taylor in his message in 1849 said:

"The position of the Sandwich Islands with reference to the territory of the United States on the Pacific . . . render their destiny peculiarly interesting to us. It is our duty to encourage the authorities of these islands in their efforts to improve and elevate the moral and political conditions of the inhabitants. . . . We could in no event be indifferent to their passing under the dominion of any other power. . . . And it is to be hoped that no one of them will attempt to interpose obstacles to the entire independence of the islands."

This was followed, in 1850, by the negotiation and adoption by the two countries of a more elaborate treaty than the original one. In 1851, President Fillmore referred to the islands in his message, expressing the hope that their differences with France might be settled, and continuing:

"Long before the events which have of late imparted so much importance to the possessions of the United States on the Pacific, we acknowledged the independence of the Hawaiian Government. This Government was first in taking that step, and several of the leading powers of Europe immediately followed. We were influenced in this measure by the existing and prospective importance of the islands as a place of refuge and refreshment

for our vessels, and by the consideration that they lie in the course of the great trade which must, at no distant day, be carried on between the Western coast of North America and Eastern Asia."

The occasion for these repeated declarations of principle was the evidently hostile intentions of both England and France toward the islands. In February, 1843, the English actually took possession, and for five months the English flag floated over Hawaii, and all Government business was conducted by a British Commission. A few years later, the French initiated a policy of annexation in the Pacific which it has steadily pursued ever since. All the indications were that the French proposed to extend this policy to Hawaii. So evident were their intentions that the Hawaiian King, Kaméhaméha III., executed a treaty ceding Hawaii to the United States; and forwarded it to Washington with the request for protection against French aggression. Orders were also issued by the Hawaiian Government to hoist the American flag upon the first indication that the French intended to land. Upon the situation coming to the knowledge of Secretary Webster, he announced the American policy by the unequivocal declaration that: "*I trust the French will not take possession, but if they do, they will be dislodged, if my advice is taken, if the whole power of the Government is required to do it.*"

The emphatic position taken by the United States prevented further foreign aggression, and the document ceding Hawaii to the United States, was, after several months detention in the State Department, magnanimously returned to the Hawaiian Government. In 1854 a full treaty of annexation to the United States was negotiated with King Kaméhaméha III., by one of the articles of which Hawaii was to come into the Union as a State. The treaty failed of execution by reason of the sudden death of the King. A few years later, a reciprocity treaty was negotiated with Hawaii, by Secretary Marcy, with no political clause, and a free list far less favorable to the United States than that in the now existing treaty. The treaty was supported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, but was lost sight of in the mighty struggle over the admission of Kansas and Nebraska. From this time on there were frequent negotiations between the two countries upon the subject of a reciprocity treaty, invariably favored by the American Executive, but opposed by the sugar interests and hampered by the engrossing

questions arising out of Slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction.

In 1868, President Johnson recommended a Treaty of Commercial Reciprocity, which had been negotiated by the State Department. The following is an extract from his address :

"It is known and felt by the Hawaiian Government and people that their government and institutions are feeble and precarious; and that the United States, being so near a neighbor, would be unwilling to see the islands pass under foreign control. Their prosperity is continually disturbed by expectations and alarms of unfriendly political proceedings. . . . A Reciprocity Treaty, while it could not materially diminish the revenues of the United States, would be a guarantee of the good will and forbearance of all nations *until the people of the islands shall of themselves, at no distant day, voluntarily apply for admission into the Union.*"

The treaty was not confirmed, however, and negotiations continued from time to time until 1876. In 1875, General J. M. Schofield, then commanding the Division of the Pacific, gave his views to Congress, through Mr. Luttrell, concerning the present treaty, then pending before Congress, as follows :

"The Hawaiian Islands constitute the only natural outpost to the defences of the Pacific Coast. In the possession of a foreign naval power, in time of war, as a depot from which to fit out hostile expeditions against this coast and our commerce on the Pacific Ocean, they would afford the means of incalculable injury to the United States. If the absolute neutrality of the islands could always be insured, that would suffice; but they have not, and never can have the power to maintain their own neutrality, and now their necessities force them to seek alliance with some nation which can relieve their embarrassment. The British Empire . . . stands ready to enter into such an alliance, and thus complete its chain of naval stations from Australia to British Columbia. We cannot refuse the islands the little aid they need, and at the same time deny their right to seek it elsewhere. The time has come when we must secure forever the desired control over those islands, or let it pass into other hands. The financial interest to the United States involved in this treaty is very small, and if it were much greater it would still be insignificant when compared to the importance of such a military and naval station to the national security and welfare."

Admiral Porter at the same time fully sustained the position taken by General Schofield in a communication to Mr. Wood.

In 1876, under President Grant and Secretary Fish, with the active support of prominent statesmen of both parties, a step further in the recognition of Hawaii's importance to the United States was taken, when both Houses of Congress approved of a treaty of reciprocity, giving Hawaii commercial advantages such as had been granted to no other country, and by which the United

States secured from Hawaii the free admission of almost all American products, and an agreement that Hawaii would make no similar treaties with other countries and concede no territory to any other country. The treaty was for seven years, to continue thereafter until after one year's notice by either party.

In November, 1881, General Comly, then United States Minister at Honolulu, reported evidences of British restlessness "on account of the predominance of United States influence and interests in the Hawaiian Islands," and that attempts were being made to extend British power at the islands. In reply, Secretary Blaine sent the following despatch :

" . . . The Government of the United States has with unvarying consistency manifested respect for the Hawaiian Kingdom, and an earnest desire for the welfare of its people. . . . Has always avowed, and now repeats, that under no circumstances will it permit the transfer of the territory or sovereignty of these islands to any of the great European Powers. It is needless to restate the reasons upon which that determination rests. It is too obvious for argument that the possession of these islands by a great maritime power would not only be a dangerous diminution of the just and necessary influence of the United States in the waters of the Pacific; but, in case of international difficulty, it would be a positive threat to interests too large and important to be lightly risked."

A further despatch in December, 1882, reviewed the relations between the United States and Hawaii, using the following words :

". . . This Government has on previous occasions been brought face to face with the question of a protectorate over the Hawaiian group. It has, as often as it arose, been set aside in the interests of such commercial union as would give Hawaii the highest advantages, and at the same time strengthen its independent existence as a sovereign State.

"The United States was one of the first among the great nations to take active interest in upbuilding Hawaiian independence and the creation of political life for its people. It has consistently endeavored, and with success, to enlarge the material prosperity of Hawaii. On such an independent basis it proposes to be equally unremitting in its efforts hereafter to maintain and develop the advantages which have accrued to Hawaii, and draw closer the ties which imperatively unite her to the great body of the American commonwealth.

"In this line of action the United States does its simple duty both to Hawaii and itself, and it cannot permit such obvious neglect of national interest as would be involved by silent acquiescence in any movement looking to a lessening of those amenities, and the substitution of alien and hostile interests. It firmly believes the position of the Hawaiian Islands, as a key to the dominion of the American Pacific, demands neutrality, to which end it will earnestly coöperate with the native Government; *and if, through any cause, neutrality should be found by Hawaii impracticable, this Government would then unhesitatingly meet the altered situation by seeking avowedly an American solution of the grave issues presented.*"

In 1887, President Cleveland and Secretary Bayard took an active personal interest in the subject, and, with the almost unanimous support of a strongly Republican Senate, renewed the Grant Treaty of 1876, for seven years, against the strong opposition of the sugar interests, and in spite of the fact that the financial benefits of the treaty were, apparently, much greater to Hawaii than to the United States. The extended treaty further granted to the United States the exclusive right to enter the harbor of Pearl River, one of the finest harbors in the world, and to establish and maintain a coaling and repair station there for the use of vessels of the United States.

Mr. Blaine stated in 1892 that there was a growing sentiment at the islands in favor of annexation, and in reply to a question as to how the United States Government would receive such an application said :

"I consider that the acquisition of the islands is of so great importance to the United States that I cannot conceive of such a proposition being refused."

The foregoing declarations of the United States and its statesmen, which might be multiplied by scores, show, first, that the "Hawaiian question," if it may be so called, has never been made a party one and show, further, that it is political, and not direct financial, advantage which has been the moving cause of the acts done and declarations made. There has always been a certain amount of sentimental regard towards the little country, on the part of its great neighbor, from the fact that American missionaries first introduced Christianity and civilization into the islands, and that hundreds of thousands of dollars were contributed by the American people and spent at the islands for that purpose ; but this cannot have radically influenced the leading American statesmen of all parties for two generations. After making all due allowance for United States philanthropy and generosity, the fact remains that the moving cause of the United States policy towards Hawaii has been the conviction that the possession or friendly neutrality of Hawaii is a political necessity to United States interests in the Pacific. With Hawaii in the hands of any hostile power, the only coaling station from Nicaragua to Hong Kong, from San Francisco to Samoa, would be closed to American cruisers, and made

a centre from which hostile descents could be made upon the Pacific coast, and its commerce destroyed.

The objective point of the several treaties has not been a financial one. The treaty of 1876 was not primarily intended as an experiment in reciprocity, for the purpose of extending American trade. It was distinctly pointed out by the opponents of the treaty, when it was before Congress, and freely admitted by its advocates, that the terms of the compact were, financially, greatly in favor of Hawaii. The object in view was not dollars, but that which dollars would not buy, the creation and maintenance of a friendly neutral State. While the financial aspect of the American policy has only been looked upon, from the American standpoint, as incidental to the main object in view, the opposition to the Reciprocity Treaty has always been based upon the claim that, however successful the treaty was politically, the United States was paying too much for its whistle. There are those to whom a dollar blots out the sun. The facts show, however, that not only has American statesmanship and foresight justified the expectation of securing a political benefit; but that the *direct financial advantages accruing to the United States and its citizens, which they would not have received but for the treaty, have more than repaid, dollar for dollar, all loss by the United States through remission of duties under the Reciprocity Treaty.*

This is a strong statement; but the proof of it is simply a matter of statistics. The following statistics have been compiled from official records wherever they were obtainable. Where not obtainable, the facts have been secured by personal investigation. In order to prove the statement above made, let us, first, credit the United States with all the duties remitted in favor of Hawaii; and, second, debit it with all duties remitted by Hawaii in favor of the United States, and all property acquired by United States citizens as the direct result of the treaty.

The total amount of sugar and molasses exported from Hawaii to the United States under the Reciprocity Treaty from January 1, 1876, to January 1, 1891, has been—sugar, 1,002,085 tons; molasses, 1,693,981 gallons. The average duty on sugar, remitted by the United States, has been, in round numbers, $40 a ton; and on molasses, four cents a gallon. The export of rice during the same period has been 60,455 tons; and of paddy (uncleaned

rice), 4,457½ tons. The average duty remitted on rice has been $40 a ton; and on paddy $25 a ton. The few other items admitted free by treaty have been exported from Hawaii in amounts insufficient to materially affect the result. The credits on Uncle Sam's books, for remission of duties on Hawaiian products, under the treaty, then are:

1,002,085 tons of sugar at $40	$40,083,400
1,693,981 gallons molasses at 4 cents	67,759
60,455 tons rice at $40	2,418,200
4,457½ tons paddy at $25	111,437
Total loss of duties by United States	$42,680,796

When the Reciprocity Treaty went into effect in 1876, there were but a few scattered, poorly equipped sugar plantations, most of which were on the verge of bankruptcy, the export of sugar in 1875 having been but 12,543 tons. But for the treaty the sugar business would have continued in the same condition, or, with the aid of East Indian coolies, would have passed under British control, with the consequent development of British influence. The commerce of the country was inconsiderable. The total value of all imports from all countries for 1875 was only $1,505,000. There were no commercial corporations other than five sugar plantations. There was no regular steam communication with the outside world, and inter-island trade was insufficient to pay the running expenses of one small steamer. There was so little insurable property and so few people who could afford to insure, that insurance cut but a small figure in business.

What the situation was in January, 1891, and what benefits have accrued to the United States and its citizens by reason of the treaty is hereunder partially shown in detail. I divide the benefits into: first, duties remitted by Hawaii; second, profits made and property acquired by Americans. The total value of imports by Hawaii from the United States from January, 1876, to January, 1891, was $47,603,670, of which $35,609,995 worth were free by treaty. The duties thereon which would have been collected by Hawaii, and which have been remitted under the treaty, are, in round numbers 10 per cent., amounting to $3,560,999.

In 1875 the total capital invested in the sugar business was, in round numbers, $2,000,000, of which about three-fourths, or $1,500,000, belonged to United States citizens. In January, 1891, the total capital invested in the sugar business was $33,455,990,

of which $24,735,610 belonged to United States citizens; increase of sugar property owned by Americans from 1875 to 1891, $23,235,610. The profits of the sugar business have varied on different estates and in different years, from actual loss, to a profit of $50 a ton. A conservative estimate of the average profit during the treaty period is $20 per ton. The total export of sugar from January, 1876, to January, 1891, was 1,002,085 tons. The profit thereon at $20 a ton amounts to $20,041,700. The proportion of the total sugar property owned by Americans shown above is 74 per cent., the profits on which amount to $14,830,858.

A commission of from five per cent. in the earlier periods of the treaty, to one per cent. in the latter, is paid on all sugars sold to San Francisco, to the agents handling it there, in addition to commissions paid the Honolulu agents. The export of sugar has been, as shown above, 1,002,085 tons, which has brought an average price of $100 a ton, making the total selling price $100,208,500. Leaving all other exports out of the calculation, this gives a total of commissions collected on sugar alone, by American agents in San Francisco, of $1,503,000. A further analysis of the commissions collected by American agents in Honolulu would more than double this, as the commission paid there has always been larger than that paid in San Francisco, and the bulk of the crop passes through the hands of Americans. Say, however, that it is no more than the amount collected in San Francisco, and the total commissions collected by American agents on sugar sales during the treaty period amount to $3,006,000.

In 1875 the total exports from the United States to Hawaii were valued at $947,260. In 1890 they were valued at $5,265,-051. The total value of all exports from the United States to Hawaii from January, 1876, to January, 1891, was $47,603,670. There was every indication that but for the Reciprocity Treaty the imports from the United States would have continued to decrease, as they had prior to 1876. If, however, they had continued the same during the sixteen years since 1875, they would have amounted to only $15,156,160. This shows that by reason of the treaty the United States has exported to Hawaii at least $32,447,510 worth of goods more than would have been exported without the treaty. It is impossible to say what the exact profit

on these sales has been, but 10 per cent. is a fair minimum, which would give a profit of $3,244,751.

Since 1875 the inter-island trading fleet has developed from a few schooners and one small steamer, to twenty-two steamers, besides a number of sailing vessels. This increase is due solely to the increase of trade caused by the treaty. During the period mentioned there have been built in the United States and sold to Hawaii nineteen steamers and twenty sailing vessels for the inter-island trade, costing $1,003,500. During the same period there have been built in the United States, and are now regularly engaged in the Hawaiian foreign trade, under the American flag, three steamers and twenty-three sailing vessels, costing $2,186,000. In addition to this there are about twelve other American vessels built before the treaty, regularly engaged in the Hawaiian trade, representing an invested capital, in round numbers, of $450,000, besides a number of transient charters made each year during the sugar season. American ship-builders have therefore built thirty-nine vessels for the inter-island, and twenty-six for Hawaiian foreign trade, a total of sixty-five, which would not have been built but for the treaty, and for which they have received the sum of $3,189,500. A minimum profit on these transactions would be ten per cent., amounting to $318,950.

Freights between Honolulu and San Francisco have varied during the treaty period from $3.50 to $7 a ton. A conservative average is $4.50 a ton. The freight on the 1,075,467 tons of rice, paddy, sugar, and molasses, exported during the treaty period, at $4.50 a ton, comes to $4,839,601. A conservative estimate of freights on other exports for the same period is $750,000, a total of $5,589,601. The freights on imports during the same period are estimated to be larger than than those on exports; but calling them the same, we have a total of $11,179,202 paid as freights on Hawaiian exports and imports during the treaty period. The percentage of Hawaiian exports carried by American vessels during 1890 was 79.24, and of imports, 61.95 per cent. A fair average for the period is, say, 60 per cent. The amount received by American vessels as freight during the treaty period is then 60 per cent. of $11,179,202, or $6,707,521. But this is not all. From 32.3 per cent. in 1881 to 15.48 per cent. in 1890, with a fair average of 10 per cent. of foreign freights, have been carried in vessels under the Hawaiian flag.

Of the vessels in the foreign trade under the Hawaiian flag, practically all are actually owned by Americans, the Hawaiian ownership being nominal, to secure Hawaiian registry, the ships being of foreign build and unable to secure American registration. There must then be added to freights received by American vessels, the 10 per cent. freights received by Hawaiian vessels in the foreign trade, or $1,117,920, making the total of foreign freights received by United States citizens, during the term of the treaty, the sum of $7,825,441. The capital now invested in inter-island vessels is, in round numbers, $1,000,000. Of this, $725,000, or 72 per cent., is owned by Americans. The average profit paid by this business is 12 per cent., or $120,000 per annum. A fair average for the fifteen years between 1876–1891 would be $100,000 per annum, equal to $1,600,000, of which 72 per cent. or $1,152,000 has been received by Americans.

In 1875 there were, with the exception of a few incorporated sugar plantations, no commercial corporations in Hawaii. In 1890 there were, other than sugar and shipping corporations, forty-three commercial corporations, with a paid up capital stock of $5,610,421, of which $3,973,505, or over 70 per cent., was owned by Americans. In addition to this, Americans are the owners of large amounts of other property in Hawaii, almost entirely acquired since 1875. The only method of estimating the value of this is by the tax lists, which credit Americans with paying taxes in 1890 on unincorporated property valued at $1,399,970. As is the case everywhere, the valuation for taxation purposes is much less than the commercial value of the property; moreover, all taxes paid by children of Americans born at the islands are credited to Hawaiians. The value of unincorporated property, other than sugar plantations, actually owned by Americans and children of Americans in Hawaii, may fairly be estimated at $5,000,000.

In 1875 the insurance business in Hawaii was scarcely worth considering. During the period from January, 1876, to January, 1890, the premiums collected in Hawaii by American insurance companies have been as follows:

Fire and marine insurance premiums	$900,410
Life insurance premiums	1,288,940

To what dimensions the insurance business has grown, is shown

by the fact that the amount of life insurance alone in American companies, in force in Hawaii during 1890, was $6,400,000.

RÈSUMÈ OF UNITED STATES GAINS UNDER THE TREATY.

First—Duties remitted by Hawaii	$3,560,999
Second—Profits made and property acquired by Americans.	
1. From increase of sugar production:	
(1) Increase of sugar property owned by Americans	23,235,610
(2) Profits made by Americans out of sugar	14,830,858
(3) Commissions paid American agents	3,006,000
2. From increase of exports from the United States to Hawaii, profits on $32,447,510	3,244,751
3. From increase in ship-building for Hawaiian trade:	
(1) Profit on building vessels for the inter-island trade	100,350
(2) Profit on building vessels for Hawaiian foreign trade	218,600
(3) Value of American shipping engaged in Hawaiian trade	2,636,000
4. From freights earned by American ships:	
(1) Foreign freights	7,825,441
(2) Inter-island freights	1,152,000
5. Property in Hawaii acquired by Americans:	
(1) Incorporated property (other than sugar and ships, which are enumerated above	3,973,505
(2) Unincorporated property (other than sugar and ships)	5,000,000
6. Premiums collected by American insurance companies	2,189,350
Total American gains under treaty	$70,973,464
Deduct American losses under treaty	42,680,796
American net profit under treaty	$28 292,668

The foregoing does not attempt to enumerate all of the profits made by Americans. The dividends of American stockholders in the commercial corporations other than sugar; the passenger receipts of American ships between the islands and California; the profits made in Hawaii by American merchant on the sale of $47,600,000 worth of imports from the United States; the subsidies paid by Hawaii to American steamships, these and many other sources of profit, evidently large but not easily reducible to exact figures, are omitted. Another source of evidence that the financial benefits to Americans are herein far under, rather than over, estimated is that the total value of exports of Hawaiian produce during the treaty period, almost all of which has been exported to the United States, has been $114,705,314. The United States has in return sent to Hawaii goods and ships to the amount of $47,000,000, and specie to the amount of $9,655,674.89. The remainder, amounting in round numbers to $56,500,000, has stopped on the American side of the water to pay for goods bought there; to pay commissions, freight, insurance, travelling expenses, education of island children, and other expenditures, all of which, after deducting the small amount necessary to pay for goods purchased in Europe, has gone to enrich and benefit the United States and its citizens to the amount of profit which they have made on each such transaction.

It is no answer to this showing that Hawaii has also profited by the Treaty; that her current revenues have increased from $878,000 in 1875–6 to $2,817,000 in 1889–90; that she has been able to make an immense number of internal improvements, which, but for the prosperity produced by the treaty, would have been impossible; that by the treaty she has been raised from commercial insignificance until she stands second on the list of San Francisco's customers—England only taking precedence. What of it? The fact that Hawaii has also been benefited does not prove the results less valuable to the United States and her citizens.

The foregoing statement partially shows the results of the policy of the United States towards Hawaii up to 1890. By the extension to Hawaii of the benefits of the American protective tariff there has been secured to the United States not only the political advantage which it sought, but, without any effort on its part, there has also been secured an enormous addition to her ship-building and foreign export and carrying trade, and there has been created a prosperous, progressive American community, which is no less American because it is across the ocean and under a tropical sky; and no less loyal to United States interests because it faithfully supports and upholds the integrity of the friendly government under which it lives. In 1890 the famous tariff bill became law. The fact that Hawaii admitted free entry of United States goods, in consideration of a protected market for her sugars, and that the opening of that market to the world practically cancelled the benefit of the treaty to Hawaii, cut no figure in the great game of politics. The fact that in the faith of the continuance of that protection upwards of $25,000,000 of American capital had been invested in the protected industry, and that the proposed law cut off all protection at one stroke, hindered the passage of the law no more than a fly on the rim of a wheel impedes the progress of the coach.

About the same amount of American capital invested in the same business in Louisiana received, in lieu of the tariff protection of two cents a pound, a bounty of two cents a pound on its sugars. By the same stroke of the pen that granted Americans in Louisiana this protection, the price of sugar belonging to Americans in Hawaii was reduced in round numbers from $90 to $50 a ton. The same amount of sugar produced in Hawaii, that

sold for $12,159,048 in 1890, will sell for only $6,963,504 in 1892, a reduction of $5,195,544, or 42 2-3 per cent., and the effect has been to reduce the selling price to, or less than, the cost of production, on all but a few of the most favorably located plantations. With rare exceptions, plantation stock is unsaleable. It is inevitable, that, if present conditions continue, an immense amount of capital invested, not only in sugar, but in industries subordinate to and dependent thereon, will be lost, and that all values at the islands will suffer seriously. Under the encouragement of the treaty, the energies of the people have been concentrated upon those articles benefited thereby, to the neglect of other products, or the development of new industries. For this reason, the variety of exports is actually less now than in 1876 and the margin of profits on sugar has been about wiped out. This means decreased exports, which in turn means decreased transportation, decreased imports, and general stagnation of business.

If, when the statistics come in, it is shown that the exports and imports from and to the two countries remain the same in 1892 as they were in 1890, the respective advantages of the present treaty to the two governments will be :

Advantage to Hawaii:	
From duties remitted by the United States	$214,931
From duties collected on imports from United States	89,682
Total	$304,613
Advantage to United States:	
From duties remitted by Hawaii	$397,802
From duties collected on imports from Hawaii	37,724
Total	$435,526
Excess of advantage to the United States	130,913

From the standpoint of justice and good faith toward Hawaii, the present American position is untenable; for, by the treaty, Hawaii is not allowed to grant any special privileges in any of her harbors to any other foreign country, whereby she might take advantage of the peculiar importance of her geographical position and obtain a value in return : nor even to negotiate a commercial treaty with any other country by which reciprocal advantages might be obtained. Meanwhile the United States not only continues to hold the chief advantage of the treaty, but in addition thereto, receives a pecuniary bonus from Hawaii of $130,000 per annum. Or, in other words, Hawaii is tied to the apron strings of the United States, prevented from helping herself, and pays the United States $130,000 a year for the privilege. From

the standpoint of protection to American citizens and development of American industries, which is claimed to be the keystone of the present American financial policy, the present American position towards Hawaii does not seem just; for, on the faith of the protection afforded the sugar industry, American capital was invested in the sugar business in Louisiana, and, when the necessities of the occasion caused a change in the form of the protection, the faith was respected and the same protection afforded in another form. American capital and enterprise, acting on the same faith, pioneered an advance into Hawaii; built up a friendly political State, and created not only the best customer, for its population, that the United States has, but produced one of the most remarkable exhibitions of creative industrial energy in history.

Hawaii's imports during 1890 were at the rate of $75 per capita, and exports of domestic produce at the rate of $144 per capita, or a total foreign trade of $219 for each man, woman, and child in the country. The exports from Great Britain during 1888 were at the rate of $31 per capita, and from Canada and the United States during 1889 they were respectively $40 and $22 per capita. The value of Hawaiian commerce to the United States is shown by the fact that during 1890 Hawaii's total export and import trade amounted to $20,105,600, of which $18,332,000 was with the United States. Its particular importance to the Pacific Coast is shown in the following statement of the foreign trade of San Francisco during the year 1890:

	Exports to.	Imports from.	Total.
Great Britain	$16,998,695	$4,685,320	$21,684,015
Hawaii	4,179,311	12,363,450	16,542,761
China	3,114,757	5,699,638	8,814,395
France	2,182,322	1,246,395	3,428,717
Central America	1,789,046	3,012,517	4,801,563
Mexico	1,570,646	800,061	2,570,707
Australasia	1,402 316	1,195,047	2,597,363
Belgium	1,089,066	725,875	1,814,941
British Columbia	871,613	1,570,052	2,441,665
Japan	717,362	7,847,974	8,565,336
East Indies	495,036	2,885,737	3,380,773
Germany	167,593	1,156,008	1,323,601
Phillipine Islands	59,687	957,954	1,017,621

The question of what the future policy of the United States towards Hawaii shall be is no longer one in which political advantage to the United States and financial advantage to Hawaii are the only factors, as was the case in 1876; for a trade has been built up, property acquired, and interests have become vested, which make the financial effect of the future American policy of more importance to Americans than it is to Hawaiians. For

every dollar that may be lost by Hawaiians by reason of that policy, Americans will lose four fold; while if, by reason of such policy, Hawaiians are prospered, Americans will benefit far more. In other words, American property interests in Hawaii have become so great that it is no longer a simple question of political advantage to the United States, or of charity or justice to a weak neighbor, which the authorities at Washington have to deal with; but it is a question involving the fortunes of thousands of their own flesh and blood, and millions of dollars worth of American property.

Since the foregoing was written the logic of events has progressed steadily and rapidly, and the United States Government is now brought face to face with a problem, the solution of which must be reached here and now. If American policy of fifty years ago required that a war with France should be risked to prevent French occupation of the islands; if in 1876 American policy required the Treaty of Reciprocity to secure and protect the political interests of the United States at the islands; if in 1882 the suggestion of attempted British predominance at the islands required the emphatic utterances of the United States Foreign Office, which are given above; then in 1893 the same policy imperatively calls for some substitute for such treaty, not only for the reasons then existing, but for the protection of American interests and property.

The independent Hawaiian Government was created by Americans; it has been repeatedly preserved from foreign conquest and rescued from internal dissension only by means of the moral and physical support of the United States Government and its troops. In spite of all efforts to carry on an independent government under the monarchical system, the reactionary influences have been too great, and that system has fallen through its own inherent weakness and inability to keep step with nineteenth century progress. It has failed and disappeared, irretrievably, beyond power of resurrection. What is to take its place? The manifest logical tendency of all the relations heretofore existing between the United States and Hawaii has been towards ultimate political and commercial union. The American origin of Hawaii's civilization, laws and judicial system; the tendency, from the earliest days, to look to the United States for support, not only against foreign aggression, but in matters of business, commerce and social life as well; the

all but consummated treaty of annexation of 1854; the prophetic utterance of President Johnson in 1868, that "a Reciprocity Treaty would be a guarantee of the good will and forbearance of all nations until the people of the Islands shall of themselves, at no distant day, voluntarily apply for admission into the Union;" the declaration of General Schofield in 1875 that "We cannot refuse the islands the little aid they need and at the same time deny their right to seek it elsewhere. The time has come when we must secure forever the desired control over those Islands or let them pass into other hands," and the emphatic declaration of Mr. Blaine in 1882 that "If through any cause neutrality should be found by Hawaii impracticable, this government would then unhesitatingly meet the altered situation by seeking avowedly an American solution of the grave issues presented;" all these steadily point in one direction and one direction only.

The parting of the ways has been reached in Hawaiian and American history. They must from this point on merge into one and jointly enjoy the mutual benefits and advantages arising from such union, or the islands will be compelled in sheer self-defence of elementary liberties and property rights to seek other means for their preservation.

This statement is specifically and intentionally confined to demonstrating the advantages and the logical necessity of annexation from an American standpoint, as this is a point of view which has, as a rule, heretofore been lost sight of in the shadow of what have been considered the greater commercial advantages reaped by Hawaii under the Reciprocity Treaty, which advantages will be increased tenfold under the impulse which will be given to the entire business of the country if annexation becomes an accomplished fact.

When the facts and considerations imperfectly presented in the foregoing statement are carefully reviewed by the people and statesmen of the United States, I do not believe they will allow these islands to be forced, by untoward circumstances, to seek the commercial alliance and political friendship of other nations—America's rivals—thus weakening the ties binding them to the nation to which they have looked with strong confidence and faith for so many years, and losing to the United States the accrued benefits of sixty years of statesmanship.

LORRIN A. THURSTON.

II. IS IT CONSTITUTIONAL?

BY GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS.

IN ANSWERING the question, "Can Hawaii Be Constitutionally Annexed to the United States?" I shall maintain the following proposition: That a foreign country cannot be incorporated into the American Union unless two things concur: First, that the foreign country is contiguous to territory of the United States; second, that in the judgment of the people of the United States, as represented by their Government, there is a controlling public necessity for its acquisition. The Constitution of the United States, Art. 4, Sec. 3, contains the two following clauses:

"SEC. 3. 1. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union, but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State, nor shall any be formed by the junction of two or more States or parts of States without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

"2. The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States, and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claim of the United States or of any particular State."

The phrase "New States" in the first of these clauses does not mean foreign States or foreign countries. It means such States as may be formed or erected according to the provisions of both clauses. These are of two kinds: First, those which may be formed by the junction of two or more States or parts of States with the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress; second, States to be formed or erected under the territorial clause out of territory belonging to the United States.

At the time when the Constitution was formed and adopted, the United States owned a large tract of country northwest of the river Ohio which had been ceded to them by the State of Virginia. There was also a confident expectation, which was soon realized, that other States would cede to the United States their claims to other unoccupied lands. The territorial clause is therefore to be interpreted by the purposes for which it was framed. It empowered the Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging or thereafter to belong to the United States. Upon this clause has been built since the year 1787 the whole system of forming States

out of territory belonging to the United States, and under the first clause cited these new States have been brought into the Union.

In addition to the power of Congress to admit new States formed in the manner above described, Congress has power to make war and the President and the Senate have power to make treaties. International wars sometimes result in the territorial conquest of the one country by the other, but the United States has never made a territorial conquest of a foreign country. In the war with Mexico the armies of the United States defeated the Mexican armies in many pitched battles, and Mexico was compelled to sue for peace. By the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo Mexico ceded to the United States large regions of country, out of which there were afterwards formed territories of the United States, some of which were admitted into the Union.

In regard to the acquisition of a foreign country by treaty there are three precedents which settle the meaning of the Constitution in this particular. The first is the case of Louisiana, which was purchased from France during Mr. Jefferson's administration: first, because it was contiguous to territory of the United States; and, secondly, because it was absolutely necessary that the United States should control the mouth of the Mississippi. The second was the case of Texas, which came into the Union under very peculiar circumstances. Texas was originally a province of Mexico. Great numbers of Americans, principally from the Southern and Southwestern States, invaded Texas, revolutionized it, wrested it from Mexico, and made it an independent country. They made it a slaveholding country, and after the lapse of some time the government of Texas sought to have her admitted into our Union. As long as Mr. Webster remained Secretary of State under President Tyler this matter was not broached. Mr. Upsher, of Virginia, succeeded him, but died suddenly in March, 1844. Mr. Calhoun then became Secretary of State. Alarmed at what he believed to be the designs and intrigues of the British Government to effect the abolition of slavery in Texas by inducing its people to change this feature of their constitution, and considering that this change in the institutions of that country would leave the Southern States of this Union on the "exposed frontier" of a free State from which they would be open to the aggressions of the Abolitionists, Mr. Calhoun took up and carried out a new and

secret negotiation that had been begun by his predecessor, Mr. Upsher, by which Texas was to be brought into the Union as a State through the action of Congress instead of having it done by treaty, which had failed. An arrangement to this effect was made with the government of Texas, and the whole project, together with the correspondence which fully disclosed the motive of the proceeding, was suddenly submitted to Congress at the session which began in December, 1844.

These views and apprehensions of Mr. Calhoun were shared by three-quarters of the people of the United States. They were concurred in by the people of the Southern States without distinction of party ; by nearly the whole of the Northern Democracy and by a few, although not all, of the Northern Whigs. It was only a minority of the Northern people which objected to the acquisition of Texas on account of its being a slave-holding country. This was the second precedent which fixed the conditions under which a foreign country can be brought into the Union.

The third precedent was the case of Alaska. Alaska was purchased from Russia, the controlling reasons for its acquisition being : first, to prevent its annexation by any other power ; and, secondly, to secure certain rights in the Behring Sea, especially the right of catching seals.

These three precedents establish the proposition which I laid down at the beginning of this article. They put a construction upon the Constitution which cannot be lightly set aside.

If I am asked why there should not be a new precedent made which will extend the scope of acquiring foreign territory by treaty so as to make it include the acquisition of a foreign country not contiguous to the United States, and not necessary to any interest of the United States, my answer would be twofold : first, that the Constitution has received such an interpretation for a long period of time as would be entirely inconsistent with the making of any such new precedent ; secondly, that if we acquire Hawaii by a construction of the Constitution which is contrary to the long-settled one, there will be no limit to future acquisitions of the same kind. When once the greedy appetite for more territory is excited it will go on, and will "grow by what it feeds on."

Public attention has been directed to the fact that Governor Marcy, who was Secretary of State under President Pierce, authorized the United States Minister at Honolulu to negotiate a

treaty with King Kaméhaméha for the transfer of the sovereignty of the Sandwich Islands to the United States. Before the negotiation could be completed King Kaméhaméha died and his successor did not choose to alienate the sovereignty of the islands. This action of Governor Marcy is cited as if it amounted to a precedent, but Governor Marcy's personal authority cannot overcome the two precedents of Louisiana and Texas which were established before he came into office, or the precedent of Alaska which was established after he left office. Nor can it overcome the precedent of Florida, which was conveyed to the United States by Spain in order to pay certain debts due from Spain to our government and to citizens of the United States.

Mr. Caleb Cushing was Attorney General of the United States when Governor Marcy was Secretary of State. Mr. Cushing was the author of the phrase "manifest destiny of the American people." He meant by it that the people of the United States were "destined" to possess the earth or so much of it as they could get and keep. The phrase "manifest destiny" was never a favorite with considerate people; nor has the sentiment which it expresses given the world at large a pleasant idea of our national character. I also see quoted the following utterance of Mr. Edward Everett, which shows that he too shared with Mr. Cushing his idea of our "manifest destiny:"

"We have no foreign yoke to throw off; but in the discharge of the duty devolved upon us by Providence we have to carry the republican independence which our fathers achieved, with all the organized institutions of an enlightened community, institutions of religion, law, education, charity, art, and all the thousand graces of the highest culture, beyond the Missouri, beyond the Sierra Nevada; perhaps in time around the circuit of the Antilles, perhaps to the archipelagoes of the central Pacific!"

Nothing could be more extravagant than this. Mr. Everett was a scholar and a statesman, but he was very much given to saying and doing things which he thought would get him popularity. I notice that a New York paper claims that Daniel Webster was in favor of acquiring the Hawaiian Islands as a prime duty of American statesmanship. I should be glad to see the proof that Mr. Webster had any such views. On the contrary, I have no doubt that he would under all circumstances have limited such acquisitions to regions of country on the continent of North America, and that he never would have been in

favor of going over the globe and annexing whatever countries we could buy.

But suppose the programme of Manifest Destiny to be carried out in the case of Hawaii, we shall then have Manifest Destiny substituted for the Constitution. It will not be long before we shall acquire numerous foreign countries in different quarters of the globe. Each of these must have a chief executive ruler. He will not be likely to be selected from the aboriginal inhabitants of the country, but he will be an American. Indeed a bill has already been introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator Morgan looking to indefinite acquisitions of foreign territory and providing—

"That whenever the United States shall acquire dominion over any foreign country or place, by treaty or annexation or otherwise, the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, may appoint a Governor for the same and a legislative Council, to consist of any number of persons, not less than five nor more than twenty-five, whose acts shall be subject to revision or repeal by Congress; and, unless the treaty of annexation or cession shall otherwise provide, said Governor and Council shall constitute and conduct all provisional government for such country or place until Congress shall otherwise provide by law."

These governors will be virtually proconsuls; and as the Roman proconsuls were not scrupulous about the methods by which they enriched themselves, so our American proconsuls will not be too delicate in the same matter. They will be very useful persons in a Presidential election, for they will be able to contribute to the purposes of a political campaign ten times as much money as any other class of officeholders all told.

Suppose, however, that the new precedent is made by the acquisition of Hawaii against the construction of the Constitution, what is the use in having a written constitution, or in having its meaning interpreted by precedents that have been established under it by the constituted authorities of the country? I leave this question to be answered by those whom it concerns. It is to be hoped that before anything else is done there will be a searching Congressional investigation of the circumstances attending the late revolution. It may turn out that it was fomented by interested foreigners and that the leaders of the revolution received improper assistance from the United States authorities.

GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS.

FADS OF MEDICAL MEN.

BY CYRUS EDSON, M. D., SANITARY SUPERINTENDENT NEW YORK HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

From time to time some form of treatment for disease or some medicine becomes suddenly popular. Physicians of repute give their testimony and record their belief in the new specific, and the patients who have been benefited manifest that strange enthusiasm to get others into trying their remedy which is so marked a characteristic of the average man and woman. The newspapers find out the latest craze and reporters become learned in many long words technically descriptive of various parts of the body or of the action on these of the new treatment. For a time he who reads or listens to the talk of others would believe the elixir has been found at last, that elixir, of which Pythagoras dreamed and which Lord Bacon thought might exist—the wonderful cure-all which is to vanquish every disease; and then, within six months, a year, two years at most, the new remedy has been forgotten or has sunk into a modest place in the pharmacopœia and the new treatment is old and of small respect. The part which medical men play in puffing these fads into prominence and repute is a most important one. Without their countenance and indorsement nothing could be done. That they so countenance and indorse them may be attributed to several causes, some inherent in medical science, others reflecting the highest praise on the physicians themselves, and again others which may only be condemned.

First and foremost of these must be reckoned the enormous number of causes which are behind any disease. It would seem to be simple enough to attribute the fever which ordinarily follows the fracture of a leg to the irritation which is set up in the limb by the accident, yet in point of fact, that fever is not seldom the result of the sympathetic disturbance of nerve centres, as, for example, those of the stomach, and in treating it it becomes necessary to take these into consideration. I have selected this

illustration because the results of such an accident as the fracture of a leg would appear to be of all things the simplest to diagnose. When we approach such ailments as nervous diseases we find ourselves literally wandering in a maze through which there is no path. It is commonly enough known, even by those who have not studied medicine, that, while each disease shows certain symptoms common to each recurrence of it, each case must be treated separately and allowance made for many things peculiar to the patient. Among these are his or her occupation in life, habits, food, constitution or stamina, previous ailments, and, above all, heredity or those tendencies which have come from his parents. Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes in "Elsie Venner" makes the old family physician refer to the knowledge he has gained, during many years of practice, of the hereditary constitutions of his patients, and the doctor adds that no school of science, no medical education, can give this knowledge to his young competitors. All this is true, wonderfully true; and it is the lack of just this knowledge of the past which makes some cases of disease so terribly puzzling and which makes each case individual in itself.

It is this individuality of cases, this fact that to one patient we must give a teaspoonful of medicine, while the next will take two, that is at the basis of the ultimate failure of all "cure-alls." And, oddly enough, it is this very individuality of cases, bringing with it to the physician so many hours of anxious thought, that makes him reach out and welcome the new treatment. He is so terribly anxious to relieve his patients, to do them good, that in the blind maze of uncertainty in which he finds himself, he hails with delight anything that promises hopefully. The practice of medicine might be defined, not unfairly, as a succession of conundrums presented for solution, with death to the patient as the penalty for failure. Who then may blame the physician for welcoming that which calls itself the key? It is the fashion to blame physicians for their ready adherence to the new, but it is an unjust fashion when the facts are considered.

There have been many medical fads, some of which have been almost funny to any one who looks at them scientifically, while others have had vitality enough to retain a place, shorn, however, of the vogue they once had. The latter are in the majority, for the greater number of these fads have really had some good in them and have been most excellent for some diseases.

About the first medical fad I can remember was the water cure. I have never personally gone through nor seen this treatment, but I know it from my reading. The patients who went to the water-cure establishments were obliged to live the most absolutely regular and simple lives. They took plenty of sleep, lots of exercise; they lived on the simplest but very nutritious food; they were forced to so exist as to give the recuperative powers of nature the fullest opportunity. Naturally, those who were worn out by work or the demands of society, whose digestion was ruined by rich food, who had, in short, lived in defiance of every law of hygiene, derived great relief and permanent benefit. True, the health conditions of the life were accompanied for the patients by an everlasting round of washing themselves in various ways, and means were taken to stimulate the excretory glands of the skin to the utmost through the use of the wet packs. Cleanliness is certainly good, and the latter helped nature to rid the body of the waste. As for the rest of the water treatment, the douches, the baths, the massage that accompanied them; no harm was done by them as a general rule. The real value of the hydropathic treatment is now thoroughly recognized; it is capitally well designed to give a person a chance to rest and to build himself up; then, too, it is a stimulant and tonic to the nervous system, but it is not the cure-all it was once believed to be. It was, of course, run into the ground; patients went to the establishments whose cases were far beyond the treatment of rest, exercise and plain food, and so it fell into disrepute by failure. Yet in some cases it is as valuable to-day as ever.

Perhaps the queerest fad of modern times was that which placed the elixir of life in blue glass. That the color of light has certain influences on life, especially life of the lower sort, as in plants, is a fact. Plant life is undoubtedly affected by the color of light, and animal life needs light. If an animal be deprived of light it will become what is called anæmic, but exactly why, no one knows. Reasoning from the observed effects of blue light on some plants, the inventor of the fad prescribed baths under blue glass for all. You were to strip yourself, I remember, and lie down under the blue glass for many hours each day. And the queerest thing about the whole business was the fact that some of the devotees not only declared themselves benefited by the treatment so long as they believed in it, but were unquestionably so benefited. I

say, so long as they believed in it, for I do not think there are many, if in fact there be one, who bathes in blue light now.

The effect of belief or faith, the effect of mind over the matter of the body, is one of the mysterious things in all science. It is unquestionably a fact, demonstrated beyond all dispute by thousands of observed cases. Long before it was admitted or studied by scientific men it was commonly known, and that, too, among races of little mental development. Who shall say when the first enemy prayed his enemy to death among the natives of the South Sea Islands? Who can tell when the first Obi man "put cunjer" on him who had defied him? The religious mysteries of vanished nations are full of recorded occurrences that may only be explained by this extraordinary power.

Let me state the fact as it has been seen. It appears to be possible for the mind of a man or woman to cause physical changes to take place in the body of that man or woman, nor have we at the present time any data showing the limit of this power. Here is a case recorded in print, as apt an illustration as may be asked: Charcot, of Paris, took a patient in the hypnotic state, placed on his skin a piece of common brown paper wet with water, and then told his patient he had put a blister on him. At the end of an hour the paper was removed, and there was a blister in its first stage—the inflamed edges, the minute cells full of serum, the partly detached skin. Now, in practice, we class a blister among those things which act mechanically—that is, by no exercise of will on the part of the patient can we suppose a fly-blister to be estopped in its action. Yet in this case the action of the blister was imitated by the action of the patient's mind. It is impossible to express in words the amazement one feels when one hears of such an experiment.

The scientific study of this strange power has revealed it to be subjective and not objective. Translating these words so dear to the German metaphysicians, we know the mind can only act on its own body, never on the body of another. If I desire, for example, to produce the blister on the body of another, I can only do this by in some way causing the mind of that other to produce it. If that other be in the hypnotic state—for purposes of this explanation this means that that other has surrendered all free will and that his mind will work under the suggestion of my will—then I suggest the

blister to him, use the paper or anything else to deceive him, and his mind does the rest. I should, perhaps, say at this point that I am speaking of hypnotism at second hand and not from my own observation. The knowledge that this power is subjective in the patient and not objective from the operator was not had prior to the time that it was scientifically studied. In the mysteries, in the work of the Obi man, it always appears as objective, and doubtless those who observed its workings honestly believed it to be so.

From what I have said, something of the remedial effect of faith on disease may be imagined. If you could persuade people to believe that the application of a cat's tail to a rheumatic limb would cure them, it is beyond a question that such an application would do them good. On this, then, rests many of the stranger fads of practice, such as the Faith Cure, directly and indirectly, the Grape Cure, the Milk Cure, the Water Cure, the Rest Cure and, in fact, nearly all of the cure-alls. As we have seen in discussing the water cure, some of these have distinctly hygienic conditions which enable nature to do her best for the patient, but added to these, and largely aiding them, comes the belief which brings about the curative influence of the mind on the body.

It may be asked whether I am not a believer in the Faith Cure. Unquestionably I am, as every physician is forced to be before he has been many years in practice. But I believe in the Faith Cure only when it is subjective; I have not a grain of belief in it when it becomes objective. And more than that, I believe in it only as an aid, as one of the remedial agents which help the patient; I have no belief in it alone except in a small class of nervous diseases. It is perfectly well known that the physician who is most successful with a patient is he in whom that patient has the most confidence, and it is equally a fact that the belief which the majority of patients have in the power of physicians to help them is one of the most important, if not the most important, factor in the successful practice of medicine. What are these but variants of the Faith Cure? Every physician has seen cases in which the patient was convinced he or she would die, and this frame of mind is of all the most dreaded by medical men, for when it appears drugs lose much, if not all, of their power to aid. But, while we recognize all these things, we can yet condemn

and laugh at the practice of the Faith Curists, for they declare their power to be objective and they claim for it an extent and range which is absurd.

Such alleged discoveries as the cure of cancer by the use of a certain plant, and the elixir of life invented by Brown-Sequard must be classed among the fungoid growths which mark the decay of the scientific mind. A word must be said, however, for the exaggerated estimates frequently given to new discoveries which are in themselves of value, and it is not unfair to rank these exaggerations among the fads of medical men. When a new drug or new medicine is brought to the attention of the profession it is rarely understood fully. Before it may be properly classed a thousand experiments must be made with it, and during these experiments the good derived from it is almost invariably overestimated. This is owing to the law which governs the effects of all medicines. For under this law every medicine does good and evil. As the good effects are often immediate, while the evil take time to show themselves, it naturally follows that they of the more hopeful sort see the former only. A striking instance of this is to be found in chloral, which, when first discovered, was hailed as a sedative having no evil in its train. We know now the chloral habit to be as awful in its effects as the morphine habit. The lesson this teaches is obvious; a medicine must be thoroughly tried before we can say what it is worth, nor should we allow ourselves to join the faddists who hail the coming of the cure-all at last.

Every new treatment, every fresh drug, every medicine that is discovered is one more drop from the great ocean of knowledge segregated that we may study it for the benefit of mankind. In it there is good and evil, but if we approach it with reverent earnestness and study that we may know, we can assure ourselves that we are helping on the great science to which we have devoted our lives. This is reward enough, and this reward shall surely come to the physician who will work. The amelioration of the physical ills of man is the end and aim of our most noble profession, and it is pleasant to remember that even the enthusiasts aid in the great work by their devotion to their fads.

CYRUS EDSON.

RECOLLECTIONS OF GEORGE SAND.

BY MADAME ADAM.

DURING the years 1868-1869 George Sand wrote to us more than once as follows : "My friends, I start for X—— in search of a scene for a romance ; will you accompany me ?" We always seized the opportunity with joy. The particular trip which I shall describe served as a frame for the novel *Malgré Tout*, of which the Empress Eugenie was generally said to be the heroine. I never asked Mme. Sand whether this was true, for she would have been sure to answer me as she had a hundred times before : "While I always make use of my own observations in my books I do not write novels *à clef*."

Madame Sand had come to Paris from Nohant, and one morning we all—M. Adam, Edmond Planchut, my daughter and myself—started for Ste. Ménéhould. M. Adam and Mme. Sand adored the game of dominoes, which they played with great skill. They always carried a set with them when going on a journey and no sooner would we have started than they would begin making the most amazing combinations. They would have nearly worked out some wonderful mathematical problem, when the train, with a sudden movement, would send the baggage, and, of course, the dominoes, in all directions, which would put us into fits of laughter and them into a very bad temper. In another instant, however, all would be serene once more, and they would start again with more enthusiasm than ever.

George Sand was much attached to Edmond Planchut. We called him "the shipwrecked one" (*le naufragé*), for he had really been shipwrecked on one of the islands of the Philippine group, in a Belgian sailing vessel, and had narrowly escaped death by the capsizing of a small boat containing seventeen of his companions. Cast upon the coast without any resources and with their clothes

in shreds they were afraid to venture inland. They lived for several days on shellfish. Despair finally seized them all, and more than once they longed for death. Edmond Planchut, however, volunteered to go in search of relief for himself and his comrades.

They all thought him mad, but nevertheless were willing to help him in an adventure that could not possibly put them in a worse plight than that in which they found themselves. Planchut started out alone, carrying under his arm a little casket, which, with his clothes, was all he had saved from the wreck. On the road he encountered some kindly folk who brought him to the Spanish governor, a young man who had not yet had time to learn that one can be severe without being cruel. In vain did Planchut tell him of his sorry plight, and of the miserable condition of his seventeen companions.

"Who will guarantee me that you are not bandits?" asked the governor. "Why should I put you on your road again? You have not a single paper by which to establish your identity."

"I have some letters addressed to myself, and they are in this casket," replied Planchut; "they can establish my identity. In Europe these letters would possess the value that they have for me, but how can I suppose that the person who wrote them will be known to you?"

"Known or not—what can these letters prove?" said the governor unrelenting. "You may have stolen them."

"Here are my letters from George Sand—stolen!" repeated poor Planchut, indignant at being insulted in his misery.

"What! letters from George Sand!" exclaimed the governor. "Can it be true?"

Planchut had already gained the door, having lost all hope. He turned round again, however, the tone in which the young man had pronounced the name of George Sand having once more kindled hope in his breast.

"Show me those letters," cried the governor.

Planchut opened the casket, and the young Spaniard, who had passed a year in study in Paris, and who was a fanatic on the subject of our great romancer, read George Sand's letters carefully, and then questioned the "wrecked one" as to their contents, Planchut's answers being of course correct. From that moment for-

ward the governor treated him as a friend, and sending for his companions, put them all on the first Spanish vessel that was leaving the port.

Madame Sand experienced great pleasure, as half laughingly and half seriously she listened to Planchut when he told her this story. M. Adam, however, never ceased teasing "the shipwrecked one" by declaring that he did not believe a word of the story, that he did it to let Madame Sand experience the joys of Monsieur Perrichon; and Madame Sand reproached Adam for his scepticism, while Planchut defended himself with devilish ingenuity. Nothing could have been more amusing than that scene.

George Sand's two leading traits were goodness and generosity. I have never seen her display her superiority in the smallest degree. Her benevolence and charity to the unfortunate throughout her life were unsurpassed.

We arrived at Ste. Ménéhould, that celebrated town rather vulgarly re-named, "Pigs' feet," and went to a small "town hotel," with an enormous kitchen at the end of which was an immense open fireplace, in which large fagots glowed and crackled. We were all famished. Madame Sand relieved us by ordering something to eat. We were then shown to our rooms, and had an hour to make our toilets.

Some commercial travellers had just left the rooms to which we were assigned. While I was opening the windows to air the room—and it was necessary to do so—my daughter and M. Adam had been searching in all directions for somewhere to wash. I heard their exclamations, followed by laughter. I was soon laughing myself, when Madame Sand, Planchut, M. Adam and my daughter returned each with a small jug in one hand containing about a pint of water. Obviously the people who had been in the hotel before us had never washed themselves! One can imagine what fun we had when on asking for more water the landlady sent us word that we would surely ruin her ceilings! But if water was scarce, the wine was perfect, the cooking succulent, and food abundant in the Hotel de Ste. Ménéhould. We found our dinner excellent, and we were all in fine trim to enjoy it.

The next day Madame Sand and M. Adam went together to visit the battlefield of Valmy. At breakfast they had a long chat about the celebrated countermarch of Dumouriez, who in 1792 blocked the Duke of Brunswick's route to Chalons and to Paris.

M. Adam, whom Monsieur Thiers called "the General," wished us to join him in his enthusiasm over Dumouriez, and with the aid of forks and salt-cellars explained to us on the breakfast table the position of the two armies so graphically that my daughter and myself understood the situation at once and joined our admiration to that of our strategist.

"If the Prussians return to France, which I think is very unlikely," said M. Adam, "our defence against invasion has become classic, and our generals could not forget Valmy."

"Don't predict war, Adam," replied Mme. Sand; "it has become impossible in our humane epoch, thank God. The Prussians won't make war against us, and we won't be indiscreet enough to declare it against them."

During the Austro-Prussian war I saw much of Heftzer, the founder of *Le Temps* and one of the few French people who favored Austria. Heftzer was a Strasbourger and knew the ways of Germany. I am from Picardy and was brought up on souvenirs of the invasion. How many times had they told me the words of the Germans in 1815: "We will return."

I hate the Prussians, who, with the English, are the enemies who bear most hatred towards the Picards.

"After the Austrians," said I to Mme. Sand, "it will be our turn. You will see that the Prussians will make war upon us; they have thought of nothing else since Jéna. If you read their school books, you would not doubt it. I think the war is probable, and I am not afraid of it."

"War is horrible," replied Mme. Sand. "Heaven preserve France from it. A series of calamities would be preferable, because war surpasses any number of misfortunes heaped upon one another."

"The Empire is war," added Adam, "because the Empire cannot give liberty. Does it desire liberty? France will allow it to continue eighteen or twenty years, never longer, and Napoleon III. will soon require to make another move.

"Why!" he added, "I met Thiers recently—we were leaving the Legislature together—and he said to me as follows, word for word: 'Adam, it is you who are in the right. There is nothing possible in France but the Republic. The day that the Emperor discovers that he will have to choose between the Republic and war, he will choose war; and never at any period of our history

were we so badly prepared for it.'" Monsieur Thiers made this statement to M. Adam in the Spring of 1869.

The carriage which was to convey us to Verdun—a large open vehicle with two horses, was ready. It was to have us at Verdun in four hours—so they said. It was then half past eleven in the morning, but it was nine o'clock that night when we arrived at that place which Quesnay de Beaurepaire defended so heroically, and which he refused to surrender to the allies, and set fire to in preference to giving up the keys.

The route to Islettes was monotonous. Mme. Sand was disappointed with it. She looked to the right and to the left, and nothing escaped her on the road that we traversed.

"I won't have a note to make of to-day's excursion," she said; "let us sup at once and go to bed so as to be up early in the morning. I hope that the 'Dames de Meuse' will have something better in store for us than what we have been treated to on the road from Dumoniez to Brunswick."

My daughter and I slept in the same bed, as there were only three rooms to be had at the hotel, which was filled with officers from the garrison. Tired out, and with the prospect of getting up early, we retired at once and went to sleep, but we were soon awakened by feeling a legion of bugs crawling over us. I lighted my candle—horrors! our sheets, our night-clothes were covered with bugs, which seemed to be raining down from the top of the bed. We jumped up and called "General" Adam, who was sleeping in the next room. He came in and declared that he would disperse the hideous battalion, which had, however, been already put to flight by the light, and gave us his bed. We slept for three or four hours, but were afraid of being late as Mme. Sand exacted from us the extraordinary punctuality which she invariably practised herself.

When we met our great friend we told her of our lamentable adventure. She shrugged her shoulders, did not give us one word of commiseration, and smilingly replied: "See what you get from not smoking! Two or three cigarettes, or half a cigar, would have chased them all away. Travellers, male or female, who don't smoke, are not travellers at all."

"And Christopher Columbus?" said Alice, my daughter, with an inquiring air; "he could not, then, claim the reputation of being a traveller, as he did not smoke?"

"You have no luck, Topaze, in your choice of an example," replied Mme. Sand—Topaze being the name she called my daughter. "You ought to know that he discovered America with the sole object of endowing suffering humanity with the benefits of tobacco, and remember this, you most ignorant of girls, as soon as Columbus discovered the isle of Cuba, he charged two men of his ship to take him ashore. He returned saying that he had seen many men and women, Indians, with little lighted tubes, inhaling a delicious scented smoke. These happy people were smoking. When you have become learned, Mademoiselle, you will have the right to argue." And as Alice was pouting a little, Mme. Sand added, "Come, come, be happy as the day is lovely. I am sure the 'Dames de Meuse' will do honor to their reputation to-day. *En route* we will have as recompense—a bushel of shrimps." *

The site of the "Dames de Meuse" is the most charming imaginable. To get there was one of the objects of our little journey, and it was going to figure in a romance for which our distinguished friend was in search of a frame.

George Sand had an extraordinary faculty for divining places. She was conversant with geology, she knew by the composition of the earth what sort of trees and flowers would be found there. She could write about a place without ever having seen it, could describe just how the light would be thrown upon certain rocks, how it would be reflected upon the water, in the distance, on the woods. On arriving at the "Dames de Meuse," after having thrown a rapid and searching glance around her, she said to us, with her bright smile, "I have found it. I am charmed."

In order to reach the inn at the "Dames de Meuse" you have to take a boat. You are rowed over the most limpid waters imaginable, and for the moment turn your backs upon the rocks that they call "Les Dames de Meuse." Once at the inn, however, they are full before you. Madame Sand looked round her in silence. She did not make a note in our presence, but till very late at night I heard her busy pen scratching away, her room being next to mine, and my daughter made the remark that our friend's pen was still "chattering" to her paper.

To our great delight, Madame Sand wished to have breakfast

* The shrimps of Meuse are the most celebrated in France.

served in the open air. The river was babbling round the rocks. We talked of this delightful country that differed so materially from the monotonous sadness of the road from Ste. Ménéhould to Verdun. The fields that surrounded us were magnificent; the corn was commencing to ripen. Madame Sand, who had a passion for horses, had a long conversation with the inn-keeper about the race of cattle peculiar to the country. Small, but beautifully formed, they gave one the idea of possessing great strength, and looked like a cross-breed between the Dutch and English horses.

For a short time while Edmond Planchut and Adam were arranging for our trip to the rocks of the "Dames de Meuse," Madame Sand, my daughter and myself, talked romance. Madame Sand in the most natural manner interested herself in what I was doing, counselled me, and told me of her own experiences. Madame Sand, like all her generation, was averse to the peasantry; in short, she classed them with those who could not understand art. I had just conceived the idea of making the heroine of my next novel to be loved of an artisan. I wanted to make him a very noble character, with the highest regard and devotion for his family, notwithstanding the fact that his father was only a simple workman. I told my story of *Saine et Sauve* to George Sand, and it really made her very angry.

"That is truly culpable," she said to me, "to make a hero of one of those men whose only recompense for his vulgar existence is the satisfaction of making money. No, those people can never possess any poetry—that would be too much.

"It is easy enough to find a good and noble artisan, as a large number among them are, imbued with a moral grandeur that is unsurpassed, but I hold that one injures them by making poetry out of this. Simply because one of these artisans, without previous education, is filled with ambitious aspirations, but has no talent, you robe him with glory.

"Is it thus that I should form my next hero?" said Madame Sand, laughingly. "I am going to make him a violinist of genius —I have the title *Malgré Tout*. Let us hear what you will call your cotton spinner? His name will be?"

"Abel" I answered.

"Well, that's amusing! *par example!* That is the name of my violinist. I don't ask you to change it, we will both keep it.

You are going to make your vulgar 'patron' imaginarily instructed—in letters, in rights, in sciences—eh!"

"Certainly."

"Mine won't know how to spell! Allons, allons, Juliette" —Madame Sand jokingly called me thus—"I demand that you surpass yourself, that you will work at your *Saine et Sauve* with ardor, and that you will put into it all that you are capable of. It will be a tilt between us."

"You who are so good, you are cruel now," I replied. "How could you want me to continue my poor little book now that you have spoken of a tilt?"

"Oh, pardon me, you are stupid, my child," she replied. "There are always among the students some who try to equal their mistress," said Madame Sand, and she embraced me with that effusion which she bestowed upon those whom she liked.

"Now for the boats," cried Planchut.

"I demand a letter from Madame Sand before embarking," called Adam; "one never knows what may happen; we might be shipwrecked, especially as we are with Planchut, and I want something to bribe the governors of the coast so that we can get back again."

"I wish to observe, Adam," said Madame Sand, "that in teasing Planchut you annoy me exceedingly."

"What do you expect? It is base envy," replied Adam. "I want to have been wrecked or to save some one who has been."

"Keep quiet, or I will hit you," cried Madame Sand, laughing.

The water of the river was so clear that we could distinguish the plants underneath and the fish swimming among them. Adam and Planchut rowed the boat. The sun lit up the water with a thousand fires, while the shade enveloped the rocks with a vestment that nearly blotted them out. The trip was delightful and gave infinite pleasure to Madame Sand.

As we were leaving the "Dames de Meuse" Madame Sand said to us: "Now, my children, I must find a road in the forest that ascends." We therefore set out in quest of a hilly road in the forest.

The woods of the Meuse, like those of Ardennes, are magnificent, every description of northern tree being found there. Madame Sand, as soon as she had discovered the place she wanted, got out of the carriage and walked along behind us.

Nothing could give an idea of her youth or gayety when she was on an excursion; she pitted us one against the other, and batted our ideas about like balls, her own serving as the racket. This used to amuse her to a great extent. She walked along—her cigarette in her mouth—notwithstanding her sixty-five years, with such agility that it was with difficulty that we kept up with her. Although she appeared to be entirely occupied with us and our jokes, she nevertheless observed all that was going on about her, discovering, perhaps, in the distance some rare flower for her greenhouse, noting some effect of nature that she would afterwards write about, "taking in" the sky, the earth, and the vista with her large eyes. "She could see out of the back of her head,' my daughter used to say.

Adam, who was so serious, and who was interested in nothing but politics, never had a dull moment when near Mme. Sand, to whom he was devotedly attached. Planchut, a similar devotee, anticipated her slightest desires and I, to whom she was the greatest of women, the glory of her sex, the beloved teacher and admired mistress, was always ready either to listen to or to divert her while my daughter, who seldom conversed, but whom nothing could quiet if she thought she was in the right, interestedly listened to Mme. Sand, who returned to us affection for affection and devotion for devotion.

Our inn that night was very comfortable. Good beds, good food, good lodging. The next day Mme. Sand visited the grotto of Han on the Belgian frontier. It is one of the prettiest in the world, and she was very enthusiastic about it. She had now discovered the complete scene for *Malgré Tout*. When we returned to Nohant she said to me: "You are friends who accompany without preoccupying. A few days' journey together brings out one's character better than ten years in Paris. You three are all excellent, although Adam is too much of a tease about shipwrecks. I always loved you, but I think I love you all a little more since our discovery of the place which will exhilarate the personages in *Malgré Tout.*"

Another search for romantic quarters, on which Madame Sand took us, was from Dieppe to the Château d'Argues on the border of the sea. I will tell about it some other time.

In the following year, 1870, we were at Nohant, at the time when the possibilities of war were first being discussed. Madame

Sand suffered intensely from the tragic perspective that all at once presented itself to our eyes. From the first hour she anticipated defeat, but Adam believed in the victory and in the triumph of the Republic. The events of 1792 and the victories of Dumouriez recurring to his memory, he said to us:

"Do you remember our journey from Ménéhould to Verdun when I told you what Monsieur Thiers said to me?" He was addressing himself to Madame Sand.

"And you," she replied, "do you recollect having told us then that never, at any epoch of our history, were we so badly prepared for it. I fear, Adam, for our country. Return to Paris, see Monsieur Thiers and tell him to do all that is possible to oppose the war. It will be the grandest act of his life."

JULIETTE ADAM.

MODERN INSURANCE AND ITS POSSIBILITIES.

BY RICHARD A. McCURDY, PRESIDENT OF THE MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF NEW YORK; JACOB L. GREENE, PRESIDENT OF THE CONNECTICUT MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF HARTFORD; SHEPPARD HOMANS, PRESIDENT OF THE PROVIDENT SAVINGS LIFE ASSURANCE CO. OF NEW YORK, AND CLARENCE H. KELSEY, PRESIDENT OF THE TITLE GUARANTEE AND TRUST CO. OF NEW YORK.

MR. McCURDY:

The possibilities of insurance are determined like those of any other business, by ascertaining how far it can be made to pay.

The particular form of insurance to be considered in the following remarks is Life Insurance, with incidental reference to other branches.

Any form of insurance, whether it be purely mutual, proprietary or fraternal, if not conducted on a paying basis, must necessarily fail. The purely mutual company will drop asunder; stockholders in a proprietary company will wind up the concern, or it will go into the hands of a receiver by process of law; enthusiasts who sustain Clergy Mutual Leagues and Employees' Benefit Associations will grow weary in well-doing and try to reinsure their risks or leave them to their fate. Assessment societies come to grief when the assessments are levied too often, and the shores of the ocean of Indemnity are strewn with innumerable wrecks of craft, fantastically named and equipped, which have met the common fate of all non-paying enterprises in a commercial age.

These are primary facts; and yet they involve an apparent paradox.

For there is, theoretically, no money made by insurance. Insurance is technically held to be all loss. Companies or associations which carry on the business are only the distributors of loss. A voluntary loss, submitted to at once by the insured, removes

the danger of a far greater loss which may otherwise happen at any time. But as the prime purpose of the aggregate premiums is to pay losses, so the single premium paid in each case by the insured is primarily a loss to the insured. The ship that goes to the bottom, the warehouse that is burned, or the life that perishes, takes out of existence just so much actual or potential capital, and the insurance money that replaces it in whole or in part is only the product of individual contributions of smaller sums, which have been sacrificed in advance, in prevision of the dreaded catastrophe or of the inevitable doom.

Where, then, is the point of contact between the first and second propositions?

It is here: That while pure insurance is but a distribution of loss, the machinery of distribution must be so constructed as to impose the minimum of self-sacrifice upon the insured and to secure for his money the maximum of productiveness. These results must be attained under conditions of the business established by long and wide experience. Experience is used in its technical sense, meaning applied statistics. Productiveness, for present purposes, means applied intelligence.

How far have the possibilities of insurance been already tested?

Francis, in his "Annals of Life Insurance," enumerates, in addition to the ordinary forms of life, marine, and fire insurance, and annuities, among others, the following schemes: to insure marriage portions; for preventing and suppressing thieves and robbers; for insuring seamen's wages; for the insurance of debts; to insure masters and mistresses against losses by servants, thefts, etc.; for insuring and increasing children's fortunes; insurance from house-breakers; insurance from highwaymen; insurance from lying; rum insurance and cattle insurance.

The marauding barons of the middle ages who, after lives of rapine, built churches and left money for masses, may be considered to have made elementary attempts to insure their future felicity. Whether the investment paid has never been ascertained.

It is recorded, also, that pilgrims to the Holy Land established a sort of Tontine, by depositing money before leaving, which was to be returned two or three-fold to those who had the luck to

come back alive. The stay-at-home members, in accordance with the spirit of the age, probably lay in wait for the returning travellers and made money. Modern Travellers' Insurance Companies do not, however, compass the death of their policy-holders. They give them the option of "your money or your life," and—they take the money.

But this is a digression.

To-day we have in successful operation employers' liability companies and various companies which insure against defalcation and breach of trust, real-estate titles, plate-glass and boilers, live-stock, hail, investments, health and accidents. The insurance of impaired lives has also been practised to some extent, but with limited success.

But in each and all of the above absolutely nothing is looked for by the insured except reimbursement in a monetary way for loss. The company, as distinguished from the assured, must make money, but the money so made is only so much additional tax imposed on the assured, which he is compelled to submit to in order to obtain the benefits of the coöperative principle. A distinction must therefore be drawn between insurance conducted simply as a loss-distributing agency by and for the benefit of the contributors, and the business of insurance carried on at the expense of the contributors by others for their own profit. In the first case there is theoretically no profit; in the other there may or may not be, according to circumstances.

We have, therefore, to consider how the practical conduct of the insurance business can be made profitable, first, to those who conduct it, and, second, to their patrons. It must pay the first class, or no attempt would be made to carry it on. It must pay the second class, or any such attempt, in the long run, would be unsuccessful. Is it not possible to carry on the business of insurance, by and for the contributors, on the same lines as those on which the business is managed for a proprietary body, so that the contributors may realize a profit instead of a loss? Here is another paradox apparently greater than the first.

The manager of a proprietary company engaged in any other kind of business does not make money by simply putting away his talent in a napkin, or, in other words, relying alone on the process of accumulation at compound interest, which is the cardinal idea of improving funds for insurance purposes purely, but by

exercising the same scrutiny and sagacity in the profitable employment of those funds in other ways for the benefit of the proprietors, as if he were an individual banker or manufacturer. Apply the same principle to the management of insurance funds for periods of sufficient duration to bring the results under the uniform operation of the law of average and we have found the key to the combination.

Life insurance is the only branch in which the two essential conditions of the best paying insurance are united, viz., a perfect scientific basis in the laws of mortality and length of time in contracts to permit accumulations and the full fruit of wise investments.

It has been during the last twenty years that the individual has realized the possibility of making money by endowment policies or accumulative dividends through the application of the principle of compound interest. This may seem to be in a strict sense impossible, for the insurance company must be paid for the risk of death, and that must come out of the premiums in one way or another. Compound interest might not alone produce anticipated results. But the investment of premiums held to await the maturity of policies, by methods not contemplated under the early limitations assumed to be fundamental, may and often does supplement the process of accumulation at compound interest, and thus results in actually making money for the insured.

For instance: Large profits were made during our Civil War by sales of gold at high premiums. Much money has been made by rises in real property bought for improvement or taken in at judicial sales. Advance in the value of many securities held by insurance companies have greatly increased either their surplus or dividend-paying power. It is plain that if the money paid for premiums can be made more productive in the hands of the insurers than it would have been in the hands of the insured, the addition will go to pay the cost of the machinery and to reduce the cost of the insurance. It follows that if the addition can be made large enough the whole of the premium or its equivalent might be returned to the insured, at last, and the protection would cost him nothing. And this is not a hypothesis. It is a fact. The records of the progressive companies show many instances where this has been the case. It

will be objected that this is not insurance but banking or simple trading. Granted: but the banking and the trading are ancillary to the insurance, and they replace the waste of the one by the profit of the other. This is in precise analogy to, although undoubtedly an expansion of, the fundamental assumptions of the business. Insurance premiums are cast on a scale which shall leave substantial margins of surplus in addition to reserves required to guarantee fulfilment of obligations. Interest above the rate assumed in their calculation is always reckoned as one of the sources of surplus, and as such becomes an integral factor. Notably is it the case in various forms of accumulative policies. This is pure banking, and recent methods have merely brought the banking factor to greater fruition for the benefit of the insured. The insured are also, through the aggregation of small individual contributions, made partners, *pro rata*, of those who often control the world of finance and reap the profits which attend the sagacious employment of large capital at propitious junctures. The apostles of the *non possumus* propaganda denounce this as rank heresy; but it is the theory of management of the progressive American life-insurance offices of to-day, and has given, and promises to give, in the future, to the business of pure life insurance, itself but a distributor of loss, the capacity of actually making money for its patrons; and this, too, without the sacrifice of true conservatism. Probably no more careful and conservative set of men could be found in any centre of financial activity than are the managers of the investment function of life-insurance companies in general and of those popularly known as the "great" life-insurance companies in particular.

But the banking feature, however important it may be, is nevertheless only one of the many elements of successful life underwriting. Probably in no other business are so many educated intelligences brought into the service of the participants in its success. To the development of the American idea, from the formulas of the early managers and actuaries to the present combinations, which almost exhaust the capabilities of the interest and mortality tables, must be attributed in a greater measure than to the banking element the phenomenal growth of life insurance in this country; but still more is it due to the unflagging energy and prolific ingenuity of the men—executive officers and mathematicians of high scientific attainments working for a com-

mon end—who have infused into their business activities the enthusiasms of a new crusade for the elevation of an administrative experiment into a robust school of faith and practice. The enthusiasms of these have been passed on to and assimilated by hosts of bright-minded and aggressive agents to whom the blending of philanthropy with closely calculated monetary problems offers sympathetic attractions possessed by no mere project of profit without protection or of protection without profit. No other business enterprise commands the services of agents possessing, as a class, higher moral and intellectual qualities, and their devotion is secured as much by this appeal to their sympathies as to their pockets. The American people are not slow to recognize and to reward devotion and enterprise wherever they meet it, and especially among their own countrymen. They recognize with patriotic pride the achievements of American companies which, through American agencies, have pushed to primacy in every civilized country one of the exemplary institutions of their land, and they reward them by their generous patronage and support.

The whole difference between the time when our ancestors were engaged in the rudest industry, and barely obtained a precarious existence by constant exertion, to the present condition of comfort for every industrious person and of luxury and wealth for multitudes, does not lie in any change that has been made in natural resources, or in the forces at the service of man. The entire change has been brought about simply by the application of intelligence to these forces and resources. The soil and the forces are constant quantities. The progressive agent in the accumulation of wealth is merely brains. Like every other human activity, if insurance can be made to pay it must be by the application of ingenuity, of thought, of experience, of wisdom. Can these, in sufficient power, be brought into its service with such effect as to make it so useful that the risk may be carried and the surplus become a substantial contribution to the wealth of the insured? Experience has answered that they can, and the answer becomes more emphatic as the accumulation of wealth becomes greater.

But time is of the essence of the problem also. The tendency of capital, when it grows beyond a moderate amount, is to increase with great rapidity, and the longer the process is continued

the greater the rapidity of the increase. Stephen Girard said that all the difficulty of accumulating an enormous fortune lay in securing the first hundred thousand dollars; and there is no doubt that any man who succeeds, having started with his own hands, and brain, in collecting a moderate competence, will be able, by continuing the same kind of effort on the same principles, if only his life and energies remain to him, to multiply indefinitely what he has obtained. The longer the life and the effort, the greater the accumulation. When the life or the effort ceases the accumulation ceases also. One or two companies, however, are based on the principle of "pay as you go." They have eliminated the accumulative factor, and consequently receive a limited support, mainly from the less intelligent and the impecunious classes. Accumulation is held to be exclusively the business of the individual and not of the company. Carried to its logical conclusion this view of the functions of capital would have neutralized organized effort from the dawn of civilization.

Wise management freed from antiquated precedent and dead tradition; accumulation superimposed upon indemnity; legitimate methods of increasing accumulation systematically employed; adoption of long deferred periods of repayment or distribution; recognition of the fact that insurance must be conducted on a paying basis, just like any other business that succeeds; in fine, a continuously productive union of the capital of the intelligent policyholder and the skilled labor of the experienced and successful life underwriter, supported by highly instructed and organized agency forces—these to-day are demonstrating the possibilities of insurance in ways till recently not fully understood, and it is to these that we must look for even greater developments in the future.

RICHARD A. MCCURDY.

MR. GREENE:

The possibilities of life insurance are embraced under two general heads: What especially can life insurance do; and for whom can it be done. But, in view of the multitude and peculiarity of the plans presented to the public, a third matter becomes of nearly equal practical importance, viz.: What life insurance cannot do.

Insurance is indemnity; it is replacing a value which has been

destroyed. A burnt house cannot be restored, but its value can be collected from other house-owners and paid to its owner who is thus indemnified ; the loss is absolute but it is distributed so that it does not fall on the original loser.

A life that is earning money for those dependent on it has as distinct a money value to them as a house or business block, or ship, or stock of goods has to its owner, which value those so dependent lose when that life ceases. But that lost value can be collected from others and paid to the dependents, so that it does not fall on them but on the contributors. That is indemnity for the loss of life : that is life insurance. Its usual machinery is by the collection of premiums beforehand, in anticipation of losses, and holding the premiums to be applied as the losses occur.

All the potencies, possibilities and limitations of life insurance are suggested in this definition. It can provide for every wife and child the indemnity, the money value, of the life of the husband and father ; for every estate, indemnity for the loss of the control of the owner ; for every creditor, indemnity for the loss of his debtor ; for every partner, indemnity for the loss of his co-partner ; for a corporation, indemnity for the loss of a specially valuable manager. In short, life insurance can legitimately provide indemnity to every person who is liable to lose money in losing a life on the continuance of which the receipt of the money depends. Scarce a family, scarce an estate, scarce a partnership, scarce a creditor, but stands more or less in danger of money loss by the loss of the productive life. Every such life is a proper subject for life insurance ; every dependent on the value of such a life, on its money-earning or producing or conserving power, is a proper beneficiary of life insurance in some degree.

The applicability of life insurance to the members of the community, either as insurers or beneficiaries, is almost universal. Nearly every one needs in some degree its protection ; on every one who has made others dependent on his life's product rests the duty of giving them its protection. Tens of millions in this country ought to be insured, because on them depend scores of millions whom they have made so dependent in some manner.

But life insurance must be paid for and it is the reverse of cheap, unless it is in a nearly worthless form. It is possible to those who can pay, and in the degree to which they can pay its cost.

This leads to an unfortunate limitation of its uses. Comparatively few can provide immediately all the indemnity their dependents need; more can provide a partial and, perhaps, very inadequate protection, and as we go down the scale of ability to pay premiums for thoroughly secure insurance, we find an increasing popularity for the makeshift schemes which seem to promise a great deal for a small present outlay in the more ambitious of the assessment or natural-premium companies, and for the industrials which collect premiums of a few cents a week for a small benefit, a necessarily expensive way, making the insurance as costly relatively as buying coal by the hod.

The death rate rises as men grow older, and the cost of their insurance, therefore, increases with age. But the "level premium" companies charge a premium which does not increase, but which after paying the smaller cost of the earlier years leaves a reserve for the greater cost of the later years. This gives an absolute stability and certainty to the operations of every well-managed company. Its policies will be paid in full no matter how small its membership may become.

Those who can pay the level-premium rate for all the insurance their dependents need get a secure indemnity at its lowest normal average cost, assuming that a proper company is selected. Those who cannot so take all the insurance needed, but do so take all they can pay for, get absolute security for that much and get it at the same rate of cost as the largest and wealthiest insurers. Their families will get what they pay for; they pay only its proper and necessary cost.

The assessment or natural-premium companies professedly charge each year only the assessments or premiums necessary to pay the actual death losses and expenses of that year, and nothing for a reserve against the increasing mortality as their policyholders grow older. While such a company is comparatively young its assessments are comparatively small, and it appears to be giving insurance very cheaply; and this form of insurance is therefore attractive to those who either have little to buy insurance with, or who from ignorance suppose the favorable conditions are permanent. But the assessment company does not agree to pay an absolute sum, only what it can collect by way of assessments up to and not exceeding a certain sum. What may be realized on a policy depends wholly on the degree of success in collecting the

assessment made to meet it; that depends on the number who can be assessed and on their willingness to pay.

As the company and its members grow older, the death rate rises, the assessments increase in frequency and amount, the burden of carrying its uncertain promises grows, and after a few years grows very rapidly, until new blood can no longer be attracted to come in and pay the heavy losses of the old; and the best risks among the latter begin to drop out in increasing ratio, until those who have borne the burden longest and have perhaps become impaired risks, and unable to get insurance elsewhere, find themselves left with practically no one to be assessed when they die, and the whole thing collapses. This is the invariable lesson of their history. These companies not only lack cohesion, but the growth of the assessment or natural premium with increasing age is a positive, constant, and, at last, irresistible disruptive force, assisted in its effect by the growing uncertainty of the amount collectible by assessment. Their value to the community is therefore, on the whole, more than problematical. They offer a deceptive substitute and by present apparent cheapness induce people to forego an immediate beginning on the only substantial, satisfactory and finally cheapest form of real indemnity.

Those who can pay only very small sums, even by small weekly or monthly instalments, take policies in the industrial companies. The necessary cost of collecting such premiums makes this business useful only to those who cannot pay in larger sums and at consequently less average cost. But nowhere is the beneficence of protection more needed than among those who can buy it in no other way.

What life insurance cannot do, but what so many companies are trying to make it appear to do, is to furnish an "investment" to the insurer in any proper sense of the term. The suggestion of it came out of the fact that the level-premium companies carry a reserve which increases up to a certain point with the age of their business, but which will, when the companies reach an equilibrium in membership, finally come to an equilibrium itself; for it is held for and is applicable to the increasing mortality of age, and what is so expended on increased death losses of the older members is replaced by that being accumulated from the payments of the younger.

Life insurance cannot be stable and secure without this re-

serve ; therefore it must be provided. But it is provided at great cost as compared with money put into a true investment for income. One buys a bond or a mortgage without expense ; holds it, collects interest and finally principal, with little or no expense ; or puts money in the savings bank where the expense of a simple management is usually trifling as a percentage on the business.

But life insurance requires a great and expensive machinery. It must have its corps of agents, supply them with material and office room, and pay all the varied items of cost for soliciting business, for collecting premiums, for examiners, for advertising, and numerous other necessary incidentals.

The annual outlay for these things in the great companies which are now pushing "investment" plans under various names is at least 20 per cent. of their entire income, both premiums and interest. One dollar of every five received by them from every source goes to pay expenses. To pay money into so expensive a scheme and to call its normal accumulation thereunder an "investment" is obviously absurd. The companies so recognize it and propose to accomplish the "investment feature" by getting policy-holders to forego dividends for ten to twenty years in the hope that so many will die or lapse their policies meantime that their forfeited reserves and savings divided up among those who live and pay through will overcome the effect of extravagance on their particular policies and give them a good thing—not out of the investment capacity of the business as a whole—but out of those who have had to drop out by the way and leave all or part behind them.

In other words, the "investment feature" in life insurance is a pure gamble either in the cost or in the substance—or in both—of what can never be anything more than indemnity, and which can be made to simulate anything else only by making it less than indemnity. It is not one of the permanent possibilities of life insurance. It is possible only so long as the victims in moderate circumstances, who are depended on to furnish the bulk of the forfeitures for the wealthy players, do not know the game they are led to play. JACOB L. GREENE.

MR. HOMANS :

It is a curious fact that the "doctrine of probabilities" or the scientific basis upon which all insurance rests, had its origin in a game of cards. That is to say, the foundation upon which this

great economy depends, and upon which it must base its claims to the confidence and patronage of the community, originated from investigations regarding games of chances. It happened in this way:

About the year 1650 the Chevalier de Mere, a Flemish nobleman, who was both a respectable mathematician and an ardent gamester, attempted to solve the problem of dividing equitably the stakes when a game of chance was interrupted. The problem was too difficult for him and he sought the aid of the famous Abbe Blaise Pascal, a Jesuit priest, author of "Night Thoughts," and one of the most accomplished mathematicians of any age. Pascal solved the problem and in doing so enunciated the "doctrine of probabilities," or laws governing so-called chances. Upon this depend not only the laws governing insurance of all kinds, but also the laws governing the motions of planets in space, and, in fact, all astronomical science.

This doctrine or theory Pascal illustrated by the throwing of dice. When a single die is thrown the chance of turning up an ace is precisely one out of six, or one out of the total number of sides or faces. But if a large number of throws are made, it will be found that each face will be turned up an equal number of times. From this Pascal laid down the proposition that results which have happened in any given number of observed cases will again happen under similar circumstances, provided the numbers be sufficient for the proper working of the law of average. Thus the duration of the life of a single individual is one of the greatest uncertainties, but the duration, or rate of mortality, of a large number of individuals may be predicted with great accuracy by comparison with the observed results among a sufficiently large number of persons of similar ages, occupations and climatic influences.

In fact all happenings may be said to result from the operation of laws, which laws may be ascertained by observation — and there is no such thing as chance. The number of buildings which will be destroyed by fire in a given time—the number of vessels which will be lost by shipwreck, the number of deaths which will occur,—not only from all causes, but from each particular cause, as suicide for instance—may be confidently predicted if only we know how many instances of each have happened in the past among a sufficiently large number of similar cases.

Hence fire, marine and life insurance are made possible, and commercially safe.

The theories of Pascal were not made practically available by him. The Grand Pensioner DeWitt, of Holland, was the first to reduce these theories to practice, which he did in 1693, by calculating the true values of annuities, based upon observed rates of mortality. Dr. Halley, Astronomer Royal of Great Britain, was the first to discover and arrange what are called life tables from which all monetary values depending upon the chances of living and dying, combined with the improvement of money by interest, may be computed. He may justly be called the father of the modern system of life insurance.

Fire and marine insurance have a much earlier origin than life insurance, but their practices were crude and haphazard until a comparatively recent period. The practice and theory of each of these three principal branches of insurance have been steadily improving until now these great economies rest on solid scientific bases. Their operations affect all classes of society, and have become a necessity of modern civilization. Insurance of any kind is at once an attribute and an evidence of civilization. It could not exist among savages, for the simple reason that there can be no adequate coöperation among them.

Insurance may be defined as a device, or measure, by which loss or damage from the happening of any named contingency may be borne or shared by the many, instead of falling upon one individual alone. With this broad definition it will readily be seen that its possible applications are numerous. Knowing by observation the number of happenings in a large class of cases within a given time, we may predict with confidence the number which will happen in future among similar cases, provided the numbers are sufficient for the workings of the law of average. This knowledge enables us to calculate the monetary values of chances, or in other words to determine the premium necessary to be charged for insurance against any named contingency.

While fire, marine and life insurance are the principal branches, and as such are well known among all classes of the community, there are others of comparatively recent origin and less widely known which have already assumed large proportions. Among these are: (1.) Accident insurance; (2.) Plate glass insurance; (3.) Steam boiler insurance; (4.) Guaranty insurance,

by which the fidelity of employees or servants is insured, also whereby corporate bonds are furnished in place of individual bondsmen; (5.) Mortgage and title insurance; (6.) Hailstone insurance; (7.) Insurance of horses, cattle, etc.

All these branches of insurance are in successful operation in the United States and in Europe. Their objects are definite and legitimate, and they afford opportunities of spreading losses which would be crushing to individuals among large numbers of persons upon whom the loss to each one falls lightly.

There are many other branches of insurance which have been projected, and in some cases actually started, some of which may prove to be a benefit to the community, while in other cases they are of doubtful utility. Among these may be mentioned: (1.) Credit insurance, by which individual losses in mercantile transactions may be borne by the many; (2.) Insurance against highwaymen and robbery; (3.) Insurance of marriage portions for daughters, which, in the British East India service, has been an important and successful branch of insurance; (4.) Insurance against issue and survivorship—a branch of business which is quite important in Great Britain, where the law of entail exists, but it is not practised in the United States; (5.) Insurance against divorces; (6.) Insurance against destruction by moths; (7.) Insurance against celibacy; (8.) Against death or injury by "tiles that may drop on a passer's head," is the title of an insurance company lately formed in Switzerland.

As a general rule insurance is carried on by incorporated companies deriving charters from the State, and subject more or less to governmental supervision. In some cases, notably "Lloyds" of London, and several marine and fire companies in the United States, insurance is carried on by associations of individuals, or partnerships, each partner assuming a definite portion of each risk.

The system of government supervision or control varies in different countries. In Great Britain and continental countries in Europe, companies are required to report general facts only regarding income, disbursements, assets, insurances in force, and liabilities estimated by themselves. In the United States where every State is a sovereign, there are forty-four different Insurance Departments. Each State may impose such conditions, restrictions and taxes upon corporations of all other States seek-

ing to transact business within its sacred territory, as its legislators may deem proper. As a result, the laws, taxes and requirements vary greatly, and impose serious burdens and expenses upon companies, which, of course, are borne by their policyholders. On the other hand, each company is obliged to answer in minute detail questions regarding its business, so that its condition may be made clear to the general public as well as to persons directly interested.

The American system then is one of paternalism, while the British system is one based upon freedom and publicity. Paternal supervision involves, logically, paternal responsibility. State control means State guaranty. Persons who insure in reliance upon governmental certificate of solvency, would, in justice, have a claim for compensation should that certificate be misplaced. But such claim could scarcely be enforced in the United States.

On the other hand the British system of freedom and publicity enables unsound or swindling companies to prey upon the general public, which has no means of acquiring exact information regarding the condition of an institution other than the reports and statements of its officials.

Probably the best system would be a happy mean between the two, where the supervision of the State would combine the maximum of freedom and publicity with the minimum of interference necessary to the ascertainment of solvency and honesty of management.

SHEPPARD HOMANS.

MR. KELSEY:

TITLE insurance as a field for corporate enterprise originated in Philadelphia in 1876. The Real Estate Title Insurance and Trust Company of that city has the credit of first applying the insurance principle to a field very different from life, fire, marine or accident insurance. In all of these latter classes of insurance the losses are the principal drain on the premium account.

Title insurance entered a field where the losses were comparatively small, but where the expenses were burdensome in the extreme, and the conduct of the business was accompanied by interminable annoyances and delays. Titles to real estate had been handled for generations on the strength of opinions of counsel; and, as it did not seem very business-like for a pur-

chaser to rely upon the opinion of the seller's counsel, he felt compelled to hire his own to repeat the work, at great expense, although experience showed that the losses escaped by so doing were trifling in comparison.

It occurred to the shrewd Philadelphians, that all that was needed to destroy the reason for the old system was, to get for a single fee, paid once and not annually, a single opinion of counsel upon which an endless row of successive owners could rely with equal safety. To get such an opinion, they reasoned, it was only necessary to place the attorney where he acted for a corporation which would pledge its capital to make good, to any one of the successive owners, any loss from mistake in that opinion, and which could profit nothing by passing a bad title along. From so simple a device, has the title insurance business sprung. The cash losses from bad titles had been very small. Hundreds of lawyers had been examining them in every large city, and going over one another's work as if it had never been done before, to the great waste of the time, money and patience of their clients.

Title insurance does not take known hazards any more than a fire company insures burning buildings. It picks out the good titles, and puts its seal upon them so that they pass current. The risk is infinitesimal as compared with that in fire insurance, where chance has much to do with it, or in life insurance, where death is certain to come. The relations of the loss account to the expense account are, therefore, exactly reversed as between the two classes. In title insurance the expenses are heavy because the work is of a professional and scientific character and must necessarily be practically commensurate with the business done. The losses, however, are insignificant.

The simplicity and soundness of the principle are such that the public has taken hold of it with apparent wonder that it was not applied before. After the establishment of the Philadelphia company, others were soon organized in New York, Boston, Baltimore, Washington, Chicago, Newark, Jersey City, St. Paul, Minneapolis, and, practically without exception, in every city of any considerable size in the United States. The business is now rapidly drifting into the hands of these companies. That it does not at once go over bodily to them is due to the fact that the habit of generations has to be overcome, and that the land-owner is very apt to go for advice, as to whether he should change his

habit, to the very attorney who is most interested in not having him do so.

Another influence contributing to the growth of the system, aside from the greater safety afforded by it and the far greater economy of it, has been the quickness with which a transfer or mortgage can be put through by its aid. To attain this celerity and at the same time to increase their safety, the title insurance companies at once found it necessary to make their own copies of the real-estate records of the counties in which they proposed to operate. In a large city, this means a stupendous undertaking. It involves the copying of every description of every piece of land described in every instrument affecting land, recorded in the Register's or County Clerk's office, from the earliest record down to the latest. In New York County, for instance, the number of such descriptions to date is about 3,000,000. These are copied and sorted, not according to the names of the parties to them, as all such records are kept in New York State, but according to the properties affected. A ledger account is opened with each separate lot of land, in which account is entered of every instrument affecting it. This assortment is made, mechanically, with a system of checks and counterchecks as efficient as a trial balance in bookkeeping. Thus the record of the piece of land is arrived at with absolute certainty, a thing that is never true of any index according to names. The record is kept up from day to day by copying every instrument recorded the day before, and posting the results to the proper accounts.

Although the cost of such a plant is enormous, it at once justifies its compilation by the extraordinary facility which it gives to the company in making its legal examinations of titles. Instead of the old and laborious practice of digging out the title and making an expensive and slow search through the indexes, a part of the job which consumed much of the time before required, the ledger account with the lot, which is practically the complete abstract of its title, is at once placed in the law department's hands and every instrument passed upon by a skilled real-estate lawyer, and the legal sufficiency or insufficiency of the title demonstrated. If the title is found perfect, the policy of guarantee is issued and the history of that title, in the plant, marked sound and it never has to be investigated again. If the title be found defective, an entry to that effect is made on its record, and

the company warned off from it, until something new cures the defect. As the business of the company increases in volume, it gradually transforms its plant from a collection of unexamined abstracts into a collection of examined and approved ones. The history of the lot at the southwest corner of Eighteenth Street and Fourth Avenue may be the same as that of the lot at the northwest corner of Seventeenth Street and Fourth Avenue, down to 1870. If the latter has been once examined and approved, the former, if submitted for guarantee, will require an examination back only to the work marked examined and approved in the other case. What, therefore, in the first case may have taken six days as against thirty under the old system, may, in the second case, take only two days as against thirty under the old system.

As the work of the company gradually covers the city, it meets, more and more, the routes previously travelled in great part, and saves more and more in the average time required to put through each new transaction. Of course any piece once insured can be transferred very simply and very quickly, and the policy re-issued to the new purchaser.

The importance of such an accumulation of information affecting the most stable part of the community's wealth, arranged so as to be at once available, is very apparent. If a railroad company wishes to get the names of every lot owner throughout the length of an avenue, for procuring consents, this locality plant can at once produce them. If the Comptroller or the District Attorney wishes to know whether a proposed bondsman owns the property claimed, the same machine can at once give the answer and tell what the mortgages upon it are. If the health authorities wish to know the name of the owner of a piece of property where a nuisance is maintained, or the police department that of the owner of a disreputable house, the locality index furnishes the information. If an intending purchaser or lender wishes, before deciding to buy or lend, to know the past history of a property—through what hands it has been, what it seems to have sold for, or what loans may have been made on it previously, or, perhaps, at what amount adjoining pieces have been sold or mortgaged—he can at once be fully posted by a reference to this invaluable index, and saved from a bad bargain or helped to a good one.

But it is not in these incidental conveniences that the title-insurance system, with its locality index, is exerting the most powerful influence for the permanent advantage of the real-estate interests. It is in the general and quick convertibility that it is rapidly giving to real estate as property. Real-estate has always been the most steady and certain investment to be had, but it has been shunned by many because they were so hampered in dealing with it. Banks have disapproved it as collateral and National banks have been forbidden by statute to accept it, and all because the question of title was never settled, and tedious delays and great expenses were involved in every consideration of it. By simply settling the question of title once for all, and having the title-insurance corporation put its stamp upon it, the one controlling obstacle to the availability of real estate as ready capital, has now been removed.

Every year is seeing a wide extension of its use where availability is important. Mortgages with title insured are being generally accepted as collateral, excepting by the National banks, where the statute forbidding it still remains in force, though the reason for it no longer exists. Trust mortgages on real-estate securing $1,000 bonds, in negotiable shape, are now common and are accepted, because, by the insurance of the title certified on every bond, the old question is set at rest. The facility that attaches to a railroad investment is thus secured for the safer and more stable real-estate investment. Even yet, this country is far behind some of the countries of Continental Europe in the use which it makes of its land as capital.

It cannot be that the United States will permit France and Germany and Austria to be more progressive than itself in making available in financial affairs the safest and surest possession—the land which is the basis of all values. It is of the highest importance to the healthy growth of this country that capital should be attracted into real-estate channels ; that it should be easy to get it in and easy to get it out ; that it should be easy to lend money on mortgage and easy to use the mortgage after it is taken. While our State legislators are looking around for new schemes to increase taxation, they should consider whether, instead of taxing mortgage investments still more stringently, they should not abolish the tax on mortgages altogether. No single measure could have more sweeping effect in turning capital from

speculative channels into the building up of our towns and cities. It would enormously increase their taxable property and bring far greater ultimate and permanent success to our tax-hunting legislators.

The unpleasant experience of the public with railroad and kindred investments, where the insider knows everything and the outsider knows nothing, has turned the attention of the cautious to landed securities which they can see, and which cannot be manipulated so that a common person cannot tell whether they are worth anything or not. It is the part of wisdom in the bankers, the legislators, the conservatives of every class, to encourage this tendency; and in accomplishing the results desired, the title insurance companies are having, and will continue to have, no small part.

CLARENCE H. KELSEY.

CONCEPTIONS OF A FUTURE LIFE.

BY THE VENERABLE ARCHDEACON FARRAR.

THE question before us is not one which treats on what is usually called Eschatology. In other words, we are not now to consider the problem of future reward and punishment, but the far more general question of the Immortality of the soul, and the bare conceivability of any incorporeal existence. Let it be said at the very beginning that we are dealing with matters which have occupied the thoughts of man since man began to think at all; and with beliefs respecting which the present solution transcends the understanding. The present solution even transcends the reason; but the ultimate solution remains in the stronger and purer hands of a hope which is sweet as fruition, of a faith which is strong as light.

Joubert, as quoted by Mr. Lilly, in his recent book on "The Great Enigma," sums up philosophy in the sentence: "*Je, d'où, où, pour comment, c'est toute la philosophie; l'existence, l'origine, le lieu, la fin, et les moyens.*" "I know not whence I am, I know not whence I came, I know not whither I am going; I wonder that I am so merry," wrote a German philosopher. It is told of Schopenhauer that once, in the streets of Berlin, he accidentally ran against a stranger. "What are you, sir?" asked the gentleman, indignantly. "*What am I?*" answered the famous pessimist; "Ah! sir, if you would only tell me that, I would give you all that I possess."

We *have* bodies, but we *are* souls, we say. But there are materialists in these days, and there have been a few in most epochs of intellectual activity, who will not allow us even this much. The Danish Prince in the tragedy signs himself, "Thine . . . *While this machine is to him, Hamlet.*" The materialist tells us that our bodies are not the machines we use, not the tents in which we live, but are our total—ourselves. We began with them, and with them we shall end, in dust. Our whole life is, they tell us:

> "A life of nothings, nothing worth,
> From that first nothing ere our birth,
> To that last nothing under earth,"

and as for the things which we are pleased to call "our souls,"

they assure us that they are mere delusions and nonentities. So it is clearly laid down in Mr. Lilly's quotation from M. Monteel's *Petit Catéchisme du Libre-Penseur*.*

Q. What is the soul?
A. *Nothing.*
Q. It is not a thing, then, existent in nature?
A. No.
Q. What is the distinction between soul and body?
A. It is a simple analytical process.
* * * * * * * * * * * *
Q. The materiality of the soul, then, involving its negative, there is no future life?
A. No; as the soul no longer constitutes for us an independent and imperishable individuality, there is no future life.

We quote this simply as a curiosity, and not even as a novel one. Voltaire has already argued that the soul is only an "*abstraction réalisée*," "like the ancient goddess Memoria, or such as a personification of the blood-forming force could be." More than two thousand years ago Pherecrates, of Phthia, had demonstrated to his own satisfaction "that the soul is nothing whatever; that it is a mere empty name; that there is neither mind nor soul either in man or beast; that the force by which we act or feel is equally diffused through the whole body, is inseparable from the body, and is in fact nothing whatever but the body pure and simple." What have we to say to such conclusions? *Securus judicet orbis terrarum.* We may safely set aside assertions respecting the very nature of our existence which have been all but unanimously repudiated by all races of men, in all countries, of all conditions, in all ages. Even the consciousness of a child tells him that there is a distinction between his soul and his body:

"The baby, new to earth and sky,
What time his tender palm is pressed
Against the circle of the breast
Has never thought that 'this is I.'

But, as he grows, he gathers much,
And learns the use of 'I' and 'me,'
And finds 'I am not what I see,
And other than the things I touch.'

So rounds he to a separate mind
From whence clear memory may begin,
As thro' the frame that binds him in,
His isolation grows defined."

The separate existence of the soul has been as much the absolute conviction of the supremest intellects, which have shone upon

* *The Great Enigma*, pp. 50 *seq.*

the world, as of the humblest and most illiterate peasants. The *Cogito ergo sum* of Descartes is unanswerable. To attribute the illimitable range and diversities of thought to nothing more than infinitesimal molecular changes in the grey substance of the brain is the most miserable, absurd, unverifiable, and impossible of all guesses. Mr. Bain may well acknowledge the difficulty of "storing up in three pounds' weight of albuminous and fatty tissue all of our acquired knowledge !"

All mankind then, except perhaps one in every ten millions, will admit that we *have* souls, and that essentially we *are* souls.

But what is the soul ?

This question has agitated all philosophy, heathen, as well as Christian.

Heathen philosophy had nothing but the merest empiricism to offer in its solution. "*Quid sit porro ipse animus, aut ubi, aut unde, magna dissensio est,*" says Cicero in his Tusculan questions. No wonder, therefore, that some philosophers believed that the soul perished with the body ; others that it lasted for a time and then was dissipated ; others that it continued for ever. As to its localization, Aristotle placed it in the heart ; Empedocles in the pericardium ; others, like our modern materialists, *identified* it with the brain ; to others again the soul (*animus*) was but the breath (*anima*). Zeno thought that it was a breathing fire. Aristoxenus vaguely declared that it was a harmony (*ipsius corporis intentio*) ; Democritus, that it resulted from a fortuitous concourse of atoms ; Xenocrates, following Pythagoras, defined it, not very luminously, as "a self-moving member." Plato analyzed it into the Reason, the Passion and the Desires. Aristotle thought that it was a sort of fifth essence, to which he gave the name Eutetechy —a name which so puzzled Hermolaus Barbarus that he is said to have evoked the Demon to tell him its true significance ! So did the ancient philosopher, like Milton's fallen spirits,

"Find no end in wandering mazes lost."

But at least the supremest among them, especially Plato and Aristotle, saw that there was a clear distinction between the merely animal and nutritive life and the true life by which we live. Plato saw deep into the bearings of the inquiry when he placed the irascible and the appetitive or concupiscential elements of our nature absolutely under the control of the supreme principle (τὸ ἡγεμονικόν), which is reason and conscience. The

lower parts of the soul, he says, passion and sensuousness, belong to the subordinate organs of perception aud representation; but the instrument of rational cogitation is the supreme and indivisible element of this soul in man. Aristotle went to the root of the matter when he declared that, since thought, foresight, learning, discovery, memory and love have no affinity with any of the four material elements, there must be a fifth element—call it an Eutetechy, or what you will—which is wholly independent of them. It is a vital force which is not merely constructive and nutritive (*τὸ θρεπτικόν*) which assimilates and reproduces, like the life of the plant. It is a reason (*νους*) beyond and above anything which exists in the animal, and which, though subject to temporary influences, is divine, preëxistent, active, determining and immortal.*

I say that this goes to the root of the matter, because the only uneasiness which haunts the minds of most men is lest the soul, after all—whatever it may be—should prove to be only an inseparable function of the body. They are half tempted to believe with Anaxemines that "it is the nature of limbs which thinketh in men"; or, in other words, that thought is but the correlate of human organization. If so, they dread lest the mind and the soul should end with the body. In answer to the difficulty we might point to the phenomena of dreams; or to the lightning-like activity of the spirit, which cannot belong to dead matter, of which inertia is an essential property; or to the power of the will to move and regulate the body, as when Turenne, shivering as he rode to battle, said to his body, "Aha! you tremble, but if you knew where I mean to take you to-day you would tremble much more;" or to the charming combinations of fancy; or to the regal powers of the imagination. All these prove, as Sir John Davies sings, that

> "There is a soul, a nature which contains
> The power of sense within a greater power.
> Which doth employ and use the sense's pains,
> But sits and rules within her private bower."

But to take only one of Aristotle's points, if the soul were but the body how would memory be possible? We remember the days of old, the vernal hours of childhood, when "the very breeze had mirth in it"; the long-lost mother who folded our childish

* Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.*, i., 123, 161, 168.

hands in prayer. Dr. Arnold said that when he was Professor of History at Oxford he quoted books which he could not have seen since he was four years old.

How can it possibly be said that it is *our bodies* which remember. Our bodies are in a condition of perpetual flux. They change—every particle of them—in some seven years. They have been scattered and renewed—every particle of them—many times over, since we were children, yet we are the same. Our individuality is unbroken. "*Dissimiles hic vir et ille puer*"; we may be but "stupid changelings of ourselves," but undoubtedly we cannot disintegrate ourselves from ourselves. How can memory and the other functions of the soul be inseparable from the body, if they continue—unchanged even when they are latent—though not one of the same material particles now belongs to us? "It is," says Coleridge, "only to the coarseness of our senses, or rather to the defect and limitation of our percipient faculty, that the visible object appears the same even for a moment. As the column of blue smoke from a cottage chimney in the breathless summer noon, or the steadfast-seeming cloud on the edge-point of a hill in the driving air-current, which momently condensed and recomposed is the common phantom of a thousand successors; such is the flesh which our bodily eyes transmit to us; which our palates taste; which our hands touch. . . And we need only reflect on these facts with a calm and silent spirit to learn the utter emptiness and unmeaningness of the vaunted mechanico-corpuscular philosophy, with both its twins, materialism on the one hand, and idealism, rightlier named subjective Idolism, on the other; the one obtruding on us a world of spectres and apparitions; the other a mazy dream."*

Yet even when we are thoroughly convinced that the soul is something wholly apart from the body, and that the body is only its machine, its instrument, its house of clay, it may seem to us so strange that it could act or feel apart from this machine and house, that the possibility of its immaterial existence may appear to be inconceivable. This difficulty would indeed only apply for Christians to the period between death and the resurrection of the body, in which they believe. Into the material difficulties of the Resurrection it is needless here to enter. Suffice it to say that by the resurrection of the body we by no means imply that

*Aids to Reflection, p. 332.

the identical particles will be re-composed which have crumbled into dust, and may now, as Shakespeare says, be used to "stop a hole," or be blown about the desert or sealed in the iron hills. When we say that *we* did so and so in childhood we mean that beings did it with whom we are identical, though not one atom of our bodies remains unchanged. So it may be at the resurrection; and the Gospels clearly indicate to us that the Resurrection-body of the Risen Christ was a glorified body, and was no longer liable to material conditions. But, while all Christians may concede this, they still fail to conceive how the soul could live immediately after death. They would fain, with Milton,

> "Unsphere
> The spirit of Plato, to unfold
> What worlds or what vast regions hold
> The immortal mind that hath forsook
> Her mansion in the fleshly nook."

Now no one can pretend to *solve* this problem, but perhaps the following considerations may make it seem less difficult.

I. Since the days of Tertullian, or, at any rate, since those ignorant hermits of the Thebaid, who thought that God had "a body, heats and passions," no one has believed in a corporeal Deity. Even Voltaire held, as Locke did, that the existence of God is *demonstrable* by the cosmological and teleological arguments,* and yet that God is a circle whose circumference is everywhere, its centre nowhere. If, then, God is a Spirit, why does the spirit of man, which is a particle of divine air and an effluence of his glory, require of necessity a material embodiment? †

II. And why has this difficulty been practically regarded as non-existent, alike by heathens as by Christians, if it were a thing naturally inconceivable by us? The human race, in general, has spontaneously and instinctively assumed that the soul, as a simple and uncompounded substance, is naturally immortal. The earliest Greeks believed in the thin, shadowy, fleeting ghost of Elysium, the εἴδωλα καμόντων. The early Hebrews, before Christ had brought life and immortality to light, believed in their dim *Sheol* and *Tsalmaveth*. The dying Hadrian sang to his soul:

> "Animula, vagula, blandula,
> Hospes comesque corporis,
> Quae nunc abibis in loca,
> Pallidula, rigida, nudula?
> Nec ut soles dabis jocos."

* See Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.*, etc., ii., 125.
† See Lactant., *De. Op. Dei.*, 19; St. Aug., *De Trin.*, x., 12, 13, 15.

The address is not unlike the famous lines of Mrs. Barbauld :

"Life, I know not what thou art,
But know that thou and I must part ;
And when, or how, or where we met,
I own to me's a secret yet.

* * * * * * *

Oh, whither, whither, dost thou fly ?
Ah ! tell me where I must seek this compound I ?

* * * * * * *

Yet canst thou without thought and feeling be ?
Oh, say, what art thou when no more thou'rt thee ?

* * * * * * *

Life, we've been long together,
Through pleasant and through cloudy weather ;
'Tis hard to part when friends are dear ;
Perhaps 'twill cost a sigh, or tear,
Then steal away, give little warning ;
Choose thine own time ;
Say not good night, but in some brighter clime
Bid me good morning.'

III. The difficulty has, however, led to the theory known as "conditional immortality," condemned as a heresy by the Catholic Church ; and to the doctrine of Metempsychosis, of which Lessing was one of the most illustrious supporters. But if the possibility of immaterial existence for the soul be deemed so inconceivable, among Protestants at any rate, the doctrine of *Psychopannychia—i. e.*, the sleep of the soul between death and resurrection—is not, I suppose, a heresy. To me, I confess, no hypothesis commends itself less. It was vigorously refuted by Tertullian,* and no less vigorously by Calvin † ; but it is still the doctrine of the Nestorians ‡ ; it has been maintained by Bonnet, and by Cudworth,§ and is said to have been the conviction of the late Archbishop Whateley, maintained by him in his anonymous volume.

IV. If the church has looked askance on this theory, there is at least no difficulty about the theory of Rudolph Wagner.‖ Carl Vogt had argued against the independent existence of the soul because "physiology sees in psychical activities nothing but

* *De anima*, 58.
† Opp., ix., 38. *De Psychopannychia.*
‡ Assernanni. *Bible Orient*, iii., pt. ii., 343.
§ Bonnet, *Palingenesia*, 1789. Cudworth, *Intellectual System*, c. v.
‖ *Ueber Leelensubstanz*, Göttingen, 1856, and *Ueber Wissen und Glauben*, id.

functions of the brain"—a doctrine which results in the conclusion that "man *is* what he *eats*," and therefore eating and drinking are his highest human functions! In answer to this, Wagner urges "that the transplanting of the soul into another portion of the universe may be effected as quickly and easily as the transmission of light from the sun to the earth; and, in like manner, the same soul may return at a future epoch and be provided with a new bodily integument."

But, in conclusion, be it observed that we do not pretend to prove or to explain; we do what is a higher act of our nature, we believe. We have, as Pascal says, an idea of the truth that no Pyrrhonism can overcome. In Mrs. Deland's "John Ward, Preacher" there is a striking scene in which the dying lawyer, in speaking to his somewhat epicurean Vicar, says:

"How strange! How strange! And where shall I be? knowing—or perhaps fallen in, an eternal sleep. How does it seem to you, Doctor? That was what I wanted to ask you; do you feel sure of anything afterwards?"

"The rector did not escape the penetrating glance of those strangely bright eyes. He looked into them and then wavered and turned away."

"Do you?" said the lawyer.

The other put his hands up to his face a moment.

"Ah!" he answered sharply, "I don't know—I can't tell. I—I don't know, Denner!"

"No," replied Mr. Denner, with tranquil satisfaction, "I supposed not—I supposed not. But when a man gets where I am, it seems the one thing in the world worth being sure of." ¶

But, after all, if the Rector could have answered, "This is not, and cannot be, a matter of human knowledge, but of divine faith," the dying lawyer ought to have felt that he had not been betrayed. We may argue with St. Thomas Aquinas that the soul being immaterial must be immortal, since a pure form cannot destroy itself, nor, through the dissolution of a material substratum be destroyed; and that the soul must be immaterial, since it is capable of thinking the universal, whereas, if it were a form inseparable from matter, it could only think the individual. But if a man cannot grasp or cannot accept this reasoning, there is nothing shocking in that sort of agnosticism which admits that "what we know is little, what we are ignorant of is immense." It is not unaided nature which teaches us the existence, the immortality of the soul. It is the light which lighteth every man who is born

¶ "*John Ward, Preacher*," p. 337.

into the world. It is the voice of God in the soul of man. Nature says:

"Thou makest thine appeal to me:
I bring to life, I bring to death;
The spirit does but wear the breath,
I know no more."

Nay, when we maintain that man is God's supremest work and that God is love, and when Nature, partially observed and imperfectly interpreted,

"Red in beak and claw with ravin, shrieks against our creed,"

we may well exclaim:

Oh life and future thou art frail!
What hope of answer or address?

to which peals the high answer of a faith which nothing can shake, which is above argument, and beyond the apprehension of the purely human understanding.

"Behind the veil! behind the veil!"

F. W. FARRAR.

SPAIN AT THE WORLD'S FAIR.

BY THE SPANISH MINISTER AND ROYAL COMMISSIONER-GENERAL.

No other nation can take a greater interest in the Exposition at Chicago than Spain, which, having celebrated at home the most important event in her history, now awaits with pride, as the discoverer of a great continent, the exhibitions of wonderful progress made by a people who during the past four hundred years appear to have reaped all that previous centuries had sown in the old world.

The Exposition has been fitly named "Columbian." Columbus was the man who, going to Spain, poor and despised, was comforted by Father Juan Perez, at La Rabida, helped by the Duke of Medina Celi, protectedby Queen Isabella, aided and encouraged by the brothers Pinzon; the man who commanded the Spanish caravels, who died a Spanish admiral, and whose descendant (the Duke of Veragua) is left as a remembrance to Spain of the great indebtedness she sustains to the Genoese who adopted her as his country.

When the World's Fair was being planned, and when all other nations were showing their great interest in that worthy and wonderful enterprise, Spain was taking steps to celebrate in a fitting manner the greatest epoch in her history—the next most important event since the birth of Christ, for humanity has received no greater benefit for its progress and its welfare than the discovery of America. This circumstance explains why Spain did not at first seem to prepare to take the place to which she was entitled in a celebration in which everything will speak in her behalf.

The end of the fifteenth century is for Spain the birth of her glory. At the same time that she threw off the Moorish yoke, against which she fought for more than seven centuries, thus saving Europe from the Mohammedan invasion, she inaugurated, in conjunction with Portugal, the era of the great discoveries made by the bold navigators of the Iberian Peninsula, which,

commencing with the travels southward in Africa of Gil de Eanes, Diniz Fernandez, Joao de Santaren, Pedro Escobar, and many others, ended with the first voyage around the world of the Spanish ship "Victoria," begun by Magellanes and brought to a happy close by Sebastian del Cano.

The voyage of Columbus to what is known to-day as the West Indies, which commenced on the third of August, 1492, and finished on the 15th of March, 1493, and which led to the knowledge we now possess of our planet, although the most important event of that age, can never diminish the greatness of the feats performed by the men, who, during the few years elapsing between 1492 and 1522, put Europe in possession of all the world.

Spain has had to honor the memory of Columbus, and at the same time to remember the brothers Pinzon who with him commanded the three caravels; Solis, who first saw the Gulf of Mexico, Florida and the River Plate; Ojeda, Vasco Nuñez de Balboa, Ponce de Leon, Cortes, Pizarro, Garay, Cabeza de Vaca, and many others who accomplished such wonderful achievements by land and sea in America, as well as to bear in mind that her Portuguese brethren, with Cabral, Vasco da Gama, Almeida, Andrade and Peixoto accomplished in Africa, Asia and Oceanica and on the shores of China and Japan, what Spain was doing in America.

The Spanish Government and the Spanish people have been celebrating the anniversary of these historical events, and it is extraordinary how little has been said by the press in this country about the important ceremonies held in the Peninsula, which saw all the Spanish and Portuguese speaking people closely united in brotherly harmony, since the United States took such a prominent part in the naval display, in the historical exhibition, and in the Congress of Americanists.

Spain has erected permanent monuments to commemorate the fourth centennial of her discovery; she has restored the convent of La Rabida where Columbus found protection, and she has raised a splendid monument at Palos in memory of all the great discoverers, as well as another to Columbus in Havana, and a beautiful mausoleum in its cathedral to hold his remains; and in order to perpetuate the memory of the noble woman who assisted him, and who was the only person to understand him, a grand statue

of the Queen and the Admiral has been erected at the city of Granada.

The celebrations in Spain and in the United States present an object-lesson of the past and of the present.

Spain, after showing her gratitude to the bold navigator, has endeavored to collect in a wonderful historical exhibition everything that could serve to portray the condition of the old world, as well as that of America, at the time of the discovery. She has likewise outstretched her arms to welcome the sixteen nations who owe their being to her. They have united their flags around the monument of Palos, whence Columbus sailed, and they have discussed their interests in many congresses over judicial, literary, commercial, geographical, medical, and military matters, that will, day by day, bring unity of thought and purpose to the Spanish race, and give it due weight in the world.

The celebration in Spain is finished, and we now turn our thoughts to the new world. Four centuries ago, in Calpe and Abida, in the so-called columns of Hercules, was written the motto we took in our coat of arms, "Ne Plus Ultra." Spain erased the "Ne" and said, with her philosopher, Seneca, that Thule was not the last of lands, and we come to see in this new world, unknown four hundred years ago, in a nation of little more than a century of independent life, sixty-five millions of inhabitants, with untold wealth and industry, and in a city that has hardly reached the middle age of a man, 1,500,000 people welcoming all the nations of the world to an exposition superior to any ever held in the older European nations.

I may have dwelt on those historical facts and the festivities that have taken place in Spain more than seems necessary, but from the former arises the interest felt by my country in the Exposition, and to the latter has been due the apparent lukewarmness of Spain towards the Chicago Exposition. Preparations are now actively going on in Spain, and I am able to give an account of the extent and plans for our exhibit.

Spain has appropriated $200,000 as its first instalment, and that amount renders it the fourth European nation as regards appropriation. Spain intends to be represented in all or nearly all the departments. Twenty thousand feet have been asked for in the Department of Fine Arts, but only 10,000 have been secured; we hope nevertheless that Mr. Ives, who has done so

much on behalf of art and who is so fond of Spanish art, may do all in his power to grant us all the space that we require.

Mr. Moret, Minister of Public Works, has intrusted to a jury drawn from the Circle of Fine Arts the task of selecting for the Fair the works that are considered the most notable from among those exhibited at the Exposition held at Madrid and from the best of our modern school. The names of Jimenez Aranda, Rico, Sorolla, Beruete and Espina in painting; Alvarez Capra, Anibal Alvarez and Amador de los Rios in architecture; Suñol, Gandarias, Alcoverro in sculpture—are a sufficient guarantee that our exhibit will be worthy of the fine-art school of Spain.

In the Department of Manufactures and Liberal Arts we desired 50,000 square feet, and, although we have only been allotted 10,000, we still hope to increase them, because, from official information I have received, Cataluña alone will send a larger exhibit to Chicago than to Paris, and from all parts of Spain we will bring a large number of products which we wish to make known to the United States and to the rest of America. Some of the most important exhibits at the Exposition of Artistic Industries at Barcelona are to be sent, and these will show the advanced condition of the technical education of our workingmen.

In the department of Ethnology and Anthropology we have obtained the 10,000 feet asked for, and we may reproduce part of the exhibit which awakened so much interest in the American Historical and European Historical expositions held at Madrid. Spain will occupy a space in the building which will enable her to behold on one side Europe, whose genius she carried to America, and on the other side the republics which have sprung from her, her exposition being thus part of the old and part of the new world. In the Transportation Building I also hope to be able to present an exhibit both interesting and valuable.

In compliance with the wishes of the Directors of the Fair I have asked that certain ancient and peculiar classes of conveyances be sent, and it is possible that we may present many specimens of arm chairs, litters and saddles and harnesses of the knights and riders of the olden times.

In the Naval Department we may behold models of the vessels that went to the Orient with the Almogavares, to Lepanto and the Terceras with Don Alvaro de Bazan and which sailed in

every sea under command of Columbus, the Pinzons, Solis, Magallanes, and Legaspi. We shall be aided in our efforts towards completing our exhibit by the Spanish Transatlantic Company which will furnish models of its ships on their lines to the Antilles, Gulf of Mexico and United States, the Plate, Philippine Islands and Gulf of Guinea; by our navy with models of its modern vessels; and by the private navy-yards of Bilbao, Cadiz, La Graña and Barcelona, with models of the ships they build for our royal navy.

In the Department of Agriculture, Cuba, the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico will exhibit coffee, sugar, tobacco, and *abacá*, and Spain her oils, preserves, woollens, mineral waters, etc. One of the departments that will attract most attention in the Spanish exhibit will undoubtedly be the horticultural, wherein all wines will be classified, if Spain is given the space to which she is entitled as one of the greatest producers of wines and as the nation which has the largest exportation of that article.

This question of wine production and sale is one that must arouse great interest in America, if considered in its true aspect, as wine is the surest antidote for drunkenness and strong drinks, and especially as a great industry and a new source of wealth might be created if the people became accustomed to the consumption of cheap wines, so as to make their production a necessity. Although the leading traits of character of the American people are those of the Anglo-Saxon race, they have distinctive habits of their own which may render them, like the Latin people, accessible to the taste for a hygienic beverage that is one of the best and healthiest foods of the working classes.

Spain, besides being an agricultural nation, has large mining industries of importance, and will make a special exhibit, among others, of iron, lead, quicksilver and marble, which, if (as public opinion seems to indicate) they will no longer encounter a barrier in the tariff, will find a ready market in the United States. Metallurgy will also be represented in this department, and there will be shown the advancement made therein, principally in Viscaya, Asturias and Cataluña.

A committee of ladies under the patronage of Her Majesty, the Queen Regent, who personally directs its work, is preparing the exhibits for the Woman's Department and they will send notable souvenirs of Queen Isabella, the good genius of Columbus.

I am not yet prepared to say what Spain will exhibit in the Departments of Electricity, Fisheries and Machinery. It has secured space in these three buildings, and it will present exhibits in all. For the last mentioned we may fully rely upon the great progress shown by our factories and machine shops, as evidenced in the excellent workmanship in the engines of the large cruisers of our navy.

Spain is erecting in Jackson Park an official building, modelled on the handsome exchange at Valence (La Lonja), constructed in 1482 by Pedro Conte, and it will be a brilliant example of the style of architecture of the transition period, from the Gothic to the Renaissance, as the discovery of America was the transition from the middle ages to our modern era.

The government of the nation which discovered the new world has ordered the exact reproduction of the Santa Maria, the *nao* or vessel from whose deck Columbus for the first time witnessed the realization of his dreams. She has already sailed, and if she has a favorable voyage she will come to Lake Michigan, where her insignificant size will remind us of the greatness of past ages, in contrast with the greatness of our present century shown in the Fair.

A General Commission, presided over by the Duke of Veragua, is at work in aid of the Exposition.

Her Majesty, the Queen Regent, has shown the liveliest interest in the Columbian Exposition from the first initiatory steps taken in Spain, and has expressed the desire to have our nation worthily represented; Mr. Canovas del Castillo, who directed in Spain the festivities of the Centenary and who held such an important place in all the congresses, labored successfully in behalf of the Chicago Exposition, and at the present moment everything is under the direction of Mr. Moret, Secretary of Public Works, whose energy, activity, and enlightenment combine to make him the best person that could have been selected to have Spain fittingly represented, in the short space of time at our command, thereby properly acknowledging the marks of courtesy shown our people by the United States.

ENRIQUE DUPUY DE LÔME.

HIGH BUILDINGS AND EARTHQUAKES.

BY PROF. N. S. SHALER, OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

IT IS evident that the advance of our architecture is rapidly making the conditions of its earth foundation a matter of increased importance. In the earlier and simpler state of our edifices they were of relatively slight height and with such reserves of strength as would enable them to withstand a considerable movement of their foundations. The need of room and the desire for display have of late led us to construct tower-like buildings which are much more dependent for their safety on a firm set earth. The development of elevators greatly favors this change in the type of our houses. It is indeed likely that we are hereafter to see a perpendicular type of architecture wherein the roofs of ordinary city buildings will attain a height to which of old only the more ambitious architects lifted their steeples.

Although architects in general are exceedingly careful in securing the foundations of their buildings against the chance of mishap, they, like other people, are disposed to regard the earth as firm set. They rarely, even in countries where serious earthquake shocks are to be anticipated, take any measures to provide against the calamities which these movements entail. Except in Japan, where long and bitter experience has taught the people to build with reference to seismic disturbances, no general precautions directed to this end have ever been taken. The only builders who have ever read the earthquake lesson aright are those of California, where in many cases admirable precautions have been taken to insure the greater edifices against the dangers which earth tremors may bring to them. We have now to discuss the question whether the architects who are shaping our great cities of the Mississippi Valley and of the Atlantic seaboard may not do well to follow the example of their brethren on the Pacific coast. To determine this question we must first consider the evidence as to the danger which is to be apprehended from earthquake disturbances in those parts of our continent.

The written history of North America is obviously insufficient

in length to give us any clear idea as to the liability of the continent as a whole to earthquake disturbances. No part of this record goes back as much as four centuries, and for the greater part of the land we know of these happenings for only about a hundred and fifty years. The untrustworthiness of this information is indicated by the fact that if we knew the seismic history of Europe and Asia only for the time during which we know that of North America, the story which has been written would be altogether different from that which the records afford. In the lack of human records we have to avail ourselves of the evidence which may be drawn from the physical state of the surface in these districts. This, though less complete and clear than ordinary chronicles, is not without value to the architect as well as the geologist, and may be interesting to the general reader.

Wherever in any country we find portions of the surface materials in a state of unstable equilibrium which would be disturbed by a considerable shaking of the ground, we may safely presume that the region has not been dislocated by a violent shock for the period during which these conditions have prevailed. Thus, where there are slender and delicately poised natural obelisks of rock formed along the faces of cliffs by the process of erosion, we may know that their foundations have been undisturbed for hundreds of years by any violent earth movement; where, also, steeply sloping masses of detritus lie at the base of cliffs we may be often sure that no earth-shaking has occurred for a period which in the terms of human history must be estimated as long. Owing to the novelty of this method of inquiry the present writer has only been able to make imperfect application of it in the fields we are considering, but the evidence indicates pretty clearly that the region of the Great Lakes, the part of the Ohio Valley lying to the east of the meridian of Louisville, the whole of the Appalachian Highlands, and the region of New England, including the district about the Gulf of St. Lawrence, has for a period of some thousand years been exempt from the more violent class of earthquake accidents such as are likely to ruin buildings constructed with a reasonable measure of precaution against a movement of their foundations. We may therefore conclude that in the districts described we may with due care reckon on meeting the hazards of this nature which are likely to arise.

Although the physical account of earthquakes which is afforded by the evidence above described indicates a tolerable immunity from violent earthquakes in the central and eastern portions of the United States, the written history of this region shows us that we may expect seismic disorders in several parts of the field. The earthquake of 1811, which had its centre of action in the region just south of the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers, was a disturbance which from its intensity and continuity has rarely been equalled in any part of the world. For a month or more the violence of the shocks was such as to break up the timber huts of the pioneers, though those buildings were of a type admirably suited to withstand strains of this description. The recurrence of this disturbance in the region, some twenty thousand square miles in area, where the shocks were most violent would probably ruin any building which it is worth while to construct. There are, fortunately, reasons, which cannot be discussed here, for believing that the visitation of the New Madrid earthquake was of a very exceptional nature, and that another such accident had not occurred in the field where it happened for many thousand years.

Along the Atlantic seaboard, brief as are the historic accounts of this district, we find two considerable fields which are evidently liable to repeated seismic visitations of moderate intensity. One of these includes the greater part of New England and the portion of the St. Lawrence Valley now known as the Province of Quebec. The other field may be described as the Carolinian, with its centre near Charleston. In the first mentioned of these areas there have been three shocks of noteworthy importance since the country was settled by Europeans. The first of these occurred in 1663 ; the second, a long continued period of disturbance affecting a small region about the mouth of the Merrimac, from 1727 to 1740 ; and the third, a widespread and strong quaking which came in 1755. The records show clearly that all these disturbances involved a sufficient amount of movement to have proved very destructive to the buildings of our time. That of 1755 recurring in the Boston of to-day would inevitably lead to a vast loss of life and property. Such was the violence of the movement that bricks were thrown from the top of a chimney thirty-two feet high, striking the ground at thirty feet from its base. The Boston of that day was mainly built of timber, and the masonry

constructions were low and strong. There was therefore no loss of life and little of property, except from the overthrowing of many hundred chimneys. Prof. John Winthrop, then Hollisan Professor in Harvard College, in his lecture on this earthquake, preserved to us in a rare pamphlet which really began the science of seismology, states that during the worst of the shock it was difficult for a person to keep his feet. Since this great shaking the New England area has been exempt from menacing disturbances, but the frequency with which the minor shocks have occurred shows very clearly that the area is liable to disturbances which may, at any time, regain the violence which characterized them in the preceding century.

The Carolinian area, though the seat of no noteworthy shocks during the colonial period of its people, has during the present century experienced two considerable shakings. It shared in the disturbances which radiated from the New Madrid district in 1811–13, but these movements did not attain to destructive violence. The shock of August, 1886, originated in this field, and though only of moderate severity, probably not as great as that of 1755 in New England, did a great deal of damage to life and property. In both these regards it was the most destructive earthquake ever known in the portion of the continent lying to the north of Mexico. Nevertheless the damage which was done was altogether of an evitable nature; a proper care in the construction of the edifices which were overthrown would have insured them from any considerable damage, and it is very unlikely that any lives were lost save through the imperfections in the structures which suffered from the earth movement. This is well shown by the fact that the lighthouses of this district, some of which experienced a test essentially similar to that which was brought upon the buildings in the town of Charleston, escaped without material injury. In fact the damage done in that city appears to have been almost altogether due to thin walls and poor mortar, along with errors in plan which made the buildings ill-fitted to withstand any movement of their foundations.

The occurrence of four earthquake shocks of importance in the last three hundred years in the region along the Atlantic coast makes it evident that from the point of view of the architect who would build in an enduring way, in a manner to insure safety, even in improbable contingencies, to those who dwell

under his roof trees, this region is to be reckoned as anything but firm-set earth. The measure of responsibility which rests upon those who control our constructions in this part of the United States may fairly be deemed grave. It is true that the probability of a great shock affecting the more important cities of the Atlantic coast in any one year is very small, but the likelihood of such a disturbance occurring during the lifetime of any well-constructed masonry edifice is clearly great.

Although the portion of our Atlantic shoreland which contains the greatest number and the largest cities of the coast, that stretched between the James River and Narragansett Bay, has since its settlement at no time been rudely shaken, there seems no reason to believe that it is in a large way less liable to disturbance than the areas which lie on its borders. At any time the tensions of the deeper earth which give rise to earthquake shocks may accumulate to a point where they have to be discharged by a movement of the rocks. The physical evidence, gathered from the conditions of the surface, would seem to indicate that the quaking likely to result from such a crisis will be no more severe than those which are recorded in New England and South Carolina, but it may be sufficient sorely to test all large constructions which have not been built with reference to it.

Assuming that our architects should reckon with the possibilities of earthquake shocks the question arises, what kind of precautions it may be necessary to take in order to avoid the dangers which such movements entail. Fortunately for our inquiry the studies of seismologists enable us to give a tolerably clear and sufficient answer to these questions. To understand the conditions, it is necessary in the first place to note the fact that an earthquake shock is in its essential features a vibration like that which is induced in a bell or tuning fork in consequence of a blow. It is not a single movement, but a series of oscillations, of which the first is the strongest, and each in the succession is proportionally less in violence. There may be, and indeed there commonly is, a succession of these blows, extending over a period of days or weeks in duration, with intervening periods of quiet. In the region which we are considering, the amplitude of the movement in each vibration is not likely to exceed an inch or two, and each swaying takes place in a rapid manner occupying perhaps less than a second of time. We should now note the fact

that earth movements are not sufficient to rend well-bound masonry asunder, except under conditions which put peculiar and unnecessary strains upon it. Even very tall structures cemented with good mortar, though they have the height of the Washington Monument, are not likely to be damaged by convulsions such as have occurred along the Atlantic coast within the historic period. The fact is that all our masonry materials, brick as well as stone, are very elastic. The reader may assure himself of this fact by throwing a boy's marble, of the species which is really composed of marble rock, upon a floor of similar material. He will at once observe that the little sphere rebounds unharmed, and with something like the spring which is characteristic of India rubber. Such marbles can readily be made to leap to the height of twenty or thirty feet without breaking. Thus it comes about that well-bound masonry can, under favorable conditions, withstand a very severe oscillating strain, the shocks being taken up by the easy and not harmful vibrations of the mass.

The danger arising from earthquakes is greatly increased wherever there is a large amount of weight in the form of masonry cornices or other decorations carried to a considerable height above the ground. The energy with which these heavy portions of the building move tends to tear them free from the subjacent masonry and from the fastenings with which they are readily retained so long as the only disturbing force is gravitation. Walls which would withstand the whip of an earthquake shock are very likely to be broken by the intense stress which comes upon them from such a weight as is often found in these unnecessary ornaments. The same objection in even greater measure applies to those structures where an upper story of heavy materials is carried on slender columns or piers of masonry. Thus many ornamental towers have above their bell-deck a considerable crown of stonework, which sometimes rises in the form of a lofty spire. Buildings so planned invite destruction from earthquakes. The vibration which is readily transmitted by the solid portions of the tower cannot be carried through the piers of the open story to the massive superstructure. The inertia of the overlying mass makes it certain that the two sections of the column cannot move in unison, and a rupture necessarily takes place.

The modern plan of having the floors of our greater buildings

composed of masonry held on iron girders has, from the point of view of the seismologist the disadvantage that it accumulates a great deal of weight at certain levels in high buildings and necessarily leads to violent thrusts upon the walls during the period of a shock. Where the seat of the disturbance which creates the earthquake is anywhere near vertically below such massive floored buildings, the inevitable tendency is to crush down the supports of these partitions and to carry the mass in commingled ruin to the ground floor. These vertically moving earthquake waves, however, commonly occupy only a small portion of the field which is affected by the movement; so this peculiar danger may perhaps be neglected.

Buildings situated in the close-set order in which they are found in the solid blocks of our great cities are much less likely to suffer from moderately violent earthquakes than are the detached edifices of like mass and height which occupy open spaces. In the serried order of the ordinary streets the structures give each other such mutual support that walls and floors may hold their position where they would otherwise be overthrown. Much also depends upon the general style of the architecture. The Gothic form, which more than any other involves a trust in the stability of the earth—with the undivided height of its internal spaces, with its great mass of masonry decoration carried far above the earth—is least fitted to withstand earthquake shocks. It is perhaps on this account that structures of this model are rarely if ever found in those portions of Europe which are subject to these visitations. The architecture which prevailed in Greece, and that which was developed in Rome, is, on the whole, better suited to afford security during earth movements than that which has taken shape in the firmer-set lands of central and northern Europe. The Romans knew particularly well how to combine dignity and ornament in construction with the strength which was necessary in buildings erected in the earthquake-ridden portion of Italy. Above all, they knew how to bind stones or brick together with good mortar, which is the first important element in guarding against such accidents as we are now considering.

It seems not improbable that a high measure of security may soon be attained against the ravages of earthquakes through the increasing use of iron or rather low grade steel in the builders' art. An edifice framed of this metal, provided proper precau-

tions were taken to tie the mass firmly together on vertical and horizontal lines, should be much more completely proof against dislocating movements than any masonry structure whatsoever. It would be possible to construct a building of this material which would defy any movement of a seismic nature except those infrequent accidents of certain rare lands where the shocks have been so furious as utterly to devastate the surface of the earth. Any very general use of steel in great buildings is apt to come about slowly. Doubtless, for a long time our architects will have to reckon with the qualities of masonry and with constructions of stone or brick.

It must not be supposed that the measure of danger which is to be apprehended from earthquake shocks in the eastern half of the United States is sufficient to justify any general change in our methods of building. The risk, however, is clearly such as makes it fit for the architect to consider how, with little departure from the paths of evident and immediate need, he may guard against the dangers which such accidents entail. If he will but bear in mind the nature of the strains which arise from the quakings to which his foundations may be subjected, he may in most cases, without greatly increasing the cost of his work, so plan and construct it as to insure its occupants and owners from danger to life and property. It seems not unreasonable to ask this care of him, for he, more than any other of the orders of society, has the wealth and welfare of the people in his keeping. If he be fully informed by the noble motives of his craft, he is already accustomed to face the contingencies of the centuries to come at the time when he makes ready for his construction. He computes not only for the resistance which is necessary in order to meet the strains brought about by ordinary winds, but for the strength which is required to resist those storms which come but once in a hundred years. It will add but little to the scope of his reckoning to take account of the accidents arising from the instability of the nether earth.

N. S. Shaler.

CLAIMS TO STATEHOOD.

I.—NEW MEXICO.

BY GOVERNOR L. BRADFORD PRINCE.

Is NEW MEXICO ripe for admission to Statehood? I answer this question unhesitatingly in the affirmative. To us, who live in New Mexico and who are familiar with its population, wealth and resources the reasons seem to be conclusive. But, in the first place, we claim that the burden of proof is not upon our side of the question. We insist that self-government is the normal condition and indeed an inherent right of American citizenship; that it is inseparable from any true idea of republican institutions.

The right to representation in the body which enacts the laws and imposes the taxes to which he is subject is dear to every American, and the right to take part in the selection of the national chief magistrate and of the local governor and similar officials is likewise one of which he will not willingly be deprived. A territorial condition, therefore, is an unnatural one, which deprives resident citizens of many of their dearest rights. A territory, as all know, has no vote in national legislation. It is directly under the authority of Congress, but has no power in that body.

We submit that this deprivation of fundamental rights is so radically opposed to the American idea of self-government that it can only be justified by circumstances which would render the ordinary exercise of those rights impossible or dangerous. We will concede that when a population is so sparse that it is not able to support a local government, one of these exceptional cases occurs, and such a population has to be ruled in some other way, and may be deprived temporarily of its right to self-government; but we insist that as soon as these peculiar conditions are removed

the disability should vanish also. To apply this practically, while in a section of country the people are so few or so poor as to make self-government impossible, they can be temporarily organized under a territorial government, in order to protect life and property; yet the moment they are able to become self-governing they are entitled to Statehood.

The American citizen in a Territory stands just as well before the law, save for his geographical situation, as any other. If one who is a resident of New Mexico, for example, steps over the border into Colorado or Texas, he is immediately invested with the full rights of citizenship, although if he moves back he loses them. There is no question, therefore, as to the fitness of the individual. No one will contend that he is more intelligent or honest or patriotic because he has crossed an imaginary line, or that he loses any good qualities when he re-crosses it.

We insist, then, that as a territorial condition is an exceptional one, only intended as a temporary expedient, and is in derogation of the civil rights of all the citizens affected thereby, the burden of proof is upon those who desire to continue the abnormal form, and not upon those who insist on the organization of a State. But while we believe that this is logically correct, still we recognize the practical necessity of proving our case before the American people affirmatively; and this I will proceed to do by a statement of the facts involved. First, however, let me quote a little history to show that the citizens of New Mexico have not only the rights in this matter which belong to their fellows in other Territories, but that a special obligation rests upon the nation to the native people of New Mexico; and that the latter have never acquiesced in the deprivation from which they have suffered.

A specific promise was made to the citizens of this Territory at the time of its acquisition. When General Kearney made his peaceful entry into Santa Fé, he issued a formal proclamation on August 22, 1846, which contained this statement: "It is the wish and intention of the United States to provide for New Mexico a free government, with the least possible delay, similar to those in the United States." The people were satisfied with the assurances of the American commander, trusted the promises of the proclamation and offered no opposition to the occupation of the whole area of the Territory. As soon as practicable after the establishment of peace under the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the people

of New Mexico showed their anxiety to have this pledge fulfilled and to possess all the rights of American citizenship by holding a convention early in 1850, adopting a constitution, electing State officers and a legislature, and Wm. S. Messervy as member of Congress. In July of that year the legislature chose R. H. Weightman and F. C. Cunningham as Senators, and they, with the member of Congress, proceeded to Washington. While on the journey they were met by the intelligence of the passage, on September 9, of the famous "Compromise Measures," which admitted California as a State and relegated New Mexico to the condition of a Territory.

From that time to the present attempts to secure admission have constantly been made. The territorial legislature has repeatedly memorialized Congress on the subject. The delegates have introduced Enabling Acts, and the people have never rested contentedly under this deprivation of their dearest rights. Nor has Congress entirely failed to respond to these appeals. Both houses of the Forty-third Congress passed an Enabling Act, the House by a vote of 160 to 54, and the Senate by 32 to 11. The bill was slightly amended in the Senate, and failed because it was impossible, at the end of the session (it having passed the Senate February 24), to bring it up for concurrence in the House. In the succeeding Congress a similar bill passed the Senate by a vote of 35 to 15, was reported favorably in the House, but failed to be reached. It may well be asked, "If it was proper to admit New Mexico in 1874 or 1876, before it possessed a mile of railroad, a single public building, a developed mine, a matured orchard or alfalfa field, why should it be excluded now, when its population has greatly increased, its condition vastly improved, and its resources of all kinds are being developed into sources of wealth?"

In the present (Fifty-second) Congress, an Enabling Act was introduced in the House of Representatives at an early day, and passed that body in the summer of 1892 with but three negative votes. It is now under consideration in the Senate, but may not be reached for action.

Proceeding now to the affirmative argument for admission, let us consider what conditions would justify the continuance of a suspension of full civil rights to American citizens on any portion of American soil. I think we may agree that they are as follows:

1. Lack of sufficient population to sustain a State government.

2. Lack of sufficient taxable property for that purpose.

3. Lack of sufficient resources to insure permanent support.

4. The unsatisfactory character of the population from lack of sufficient education, or patriotism, or law-abiding qualities.

Any of these conditions, we will admit, would be sufficient to negative the proposition that a territory is "ripe for Statehood," but I propose to show, as briefly as possible, that none of them exists in New Mexico.

In respect to population the claim to Statehood is indisputable. No territory at the time of its admission, with the single exception of Dakota, has contained the population now in New Mexico. By the census of 1890 it had 153,076 inhabitants, without counting the Indians on the reservations. The real population, as has been conclusively shown in public documents, was between 180,000 and 185,000; the difficulty of full enumeration where the area is so vast and the population so scattered, accounting for the difference. But taking the census figures, the above statement as to other territories is correct.

It should be remembered that in many of the Territories at the time of their admission a large fraction of the population was made up of slaves who were not citizens and had no vote. Thus in Missouri there were over 10,000 slaves; in Florida over 25,000 and in Louisiana over 34,000. When these numbers are deducted it reduces the self-governing population quite materially. So it is evident that there is now no reason, on the score of lack of sufficient population, for depriving the people of New Mexico of the ordinary rights of citizens. On the contrary it has more population than Idaho and Wyoming combined, considerably more than Montana, nearly or quite four times as much as Nevada, and 15,000 more than Delaware.

The next question is whether New Mexico possesses sufficient financial strength to support a State government. The assessed valuation of property in 1891 was $45,329,563. This is much larger than that of many other Territories at the time of their admission. The valuation of the last two States, for example, immediately before their admission, was as follows: Idaho, $23,948,039; Wyoming, $31,431,495. The credit of New Mexico is excellent notwithstanding the prejudice against territorial securi-

ties in the financial centres. The only bonds issued during the last four years were $25,000 for the completion of the Insane Asylum, and although there was some question as to their being in excess of the limit established by Congress, yet they sold for 105½. Since July, 1889, the Territory has been gradually redeeming and cancelling its outstanding penitentiary bonds to an amount between $40,000 and $50,000, and for these it was compelled to pay from 107 to 117 per cent., although advertisements were issued in all the great money centres asking for lowest bids.

As an evidence of the public spirit of the people, as well as an exhibition of financial strength, it may be stated that no Territory has ever erected so many public buildings, or possessed so much property, as New Mexico. Without the slightest aid from the public national Government it has built a beautiful Capitol, a substantial Penitentiary, and more recently an Insane Asylum, a University, an Agricultural College and a School of Mines. All these structures are more than creditable—they are sources of pride and gratification ; and the last four have been paid for from taxation, without the incurring of any indebtedness, except the sum of $25,000 to complete the Insane Asylum. In nearly all the newer States the institutions of a similar character have been erected wholly or in part by grants of land made at the time of their admission, but New Mexico has not waited for such assistance. In addition to the above more than half of our counties have erected commodious court-houses of stone or brick within the past ten years.

We may make the broad assertion that New Mexico is endowed with greater natural resources, and in greater variety, than any other State or Territory of the Union. This sounds extravagant and may be considered as a specimen of Western hyperbole, but it is made with an entire appreciation of its full significance, and is well considered and deliberate. In reckoning these resources, I include facilities for agriculture and horticulture and for the raising of animals ; and all classes of mineral deposits, metallic and non-metallic. Only one State approaches it in its natural endowments, and that is California ; and the possession of almost limitless beds of coal, both bituminous and anthracite, give New Mexico a superiority even over that favored State. If space permitted, it would be easy to show the truth of this general statement. As it is, I must refer for the particulars

to more extended documents where each class of product is discussed separately.

The character of the people, composed of the solid and conservative native element of Spanish descent, in connection with the energetic and enterprising, but sometimes over-zealous, Anglo-American from the East, is specially adapted for self-government. By many in the East the people are looked upon as foreign, and not in harmony with American institutions. It is strange that this suggestion should arise in a land which absorbs half a million of foreigners every year, and which manages to assimilate the very worst elements of Continental Europe. It should be remembered that New Mexico was annexed in 1846, and all of its inhabitants except the oldest were born on American soil, and that its people belonged to a sister Republic with institutions similar to ours, and so were not ignorant of the principles of free government. For almost half a century they have been electing their legislatures, making their laws and carrying on their local government under the American system.

Our citizens are mainly the descendants of the two great nations which insisted on the rights of the people in England under Magna Charta and drove the Moors out of Spain that self government should reign there. They are the children of the patriots who fought for the independence of the United States in 1776, and in Mexico from 1810 to 1821. Surely the sons of such sires must be capable of self-government! The population is very largely native American by birth. The foreign element is smaller in New Mexico than anywhere in the country except in certain Southern States. A comparison with Territories recently admitted is instructive in this regard. The figures are taken from the recent census of 1890. According to this, New Mexico contains 7,915 foreign-born inhabitants to 100,000 native-born, or less than 8 to 100. Idaho has 26 foreign to 100 natives; Wyoming 32 to 100; Washington 35 to 100; South Dakota 35 to 100; Montana 48 to 100, and North Dakota 80 to 100. Even in the older States, Massachusetts, New York and Michigan have 35 to 100; California, 43; Rhode Island and Wisconsin, 44; Minnesota, 55. New Mexico, therefore, is a peculiarly "native American" country.

By many the large number of voters of Spanish descent is looked upon as a grave misfortune. This is a mistake. Every

one familiar with the Far West knows that the principal danger in new American communities arises from the unsettled and irresponsible character of much of the population. They have energy, intelligence, vigor and enterprise, and we recognize them in those respects as good State builders; but, at the same time, they have some characteristics not so desirable. One of the most noticeable is the migratory habit.

The number of men through all that region with whom two years is a long residence in any one place is astonishing. Of course there are many solid, substantial citizens, but this restless, nomadic population constitutes an element that is always active, aggressive and noisy, ready to vote for any amount of bonds and taxation, and to their irresponsible action is principally due the heavy indebtedness of so many Western cities and counties. They do the mischief, and are gone before its effects are felt. But New Mexico runs no such risk. She has a stable, responsible and conservative element in her native population which counteracts the danger. By itself this element might be too slow and non-progressive, but mixed with the over-zealous American it forms an admirable combination.

Some years ago there may have been some force in the argument of illiteracy, but it is fast disappearing. In no respect has New Mexico been making such rapid progress as in public education. Even under the comparatively crude system which existed before the public school law of 1891, the number of children under instruction had increased in a ratio far in advance of the population. The late census developed the fact that while the population of the territory increased 28 per cent. during the decade from 1880 to 1890, the number of children enrolled in the schools increased 283 per cent., or ten times as rapidly. The crowning work of the last legislature was that relative to public instruction. Under its beneficent provisions the educational system is improving with great rapidity.

It should be remembered that all this improvement has been effected by direct taxation, as we have no school fund whatever. There can be none until we are admitted as a State. Should all of the older States be deprived of their school funds, a lamentable condition of educational affairs would result in many of them. With Statehood come the grants of land from the public domain for educational purposes. So long as New Mexico is a territory it can

have no grants and no fund. This is not the fault of the people, for they have been asking for these advantages for years.

When charged with illiteracy they ask for the immediate grant of these lands, and the uniform reply is that they are not yet a State. Then, when asking for Statehood, they are told that they are too illiterate. So the argument of refusal proceeds in a very unsatisfactory circle. If the educational matter is to be weighed against us, it should be weighed in the direction of giving us Statehood, which will increase our means for public education, rather than in depriving us of it.

The native New Mexicans proved their loyalty to the flag by sending 6,561 soldiers into the field out of a total population of 93,567 in the days of the Rebeliion, when the total number of volunteers from the Territories comprising the six new States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, Montana, Idaho and Wyoming was but 1,170; Colorado sent but 4,903, and Nebraska, Nevada and Oregon together contributed but 6,047. New Mexico's volunteers fought at Valverde, Peralta, and on other fields; and at Glorieta, together with their comrades of Colorado, defeated the enemy and turned back the column which was advancing northerly from Texas with the intention of cutting off the Pacific slope from the remainder of the country. The value of that service to the Union cause can scarcely be over-estimated.

All of our newly-settled communities have more than their share of law-breakers. But New Mexico is far less affected in this way than other Territories, because it is to a large extent an old country. The desperados who crossed the plains found there a settled government, and a population which would not tolerate their lawlessness, and so they quickly passed on to more congenial climes. The situation cannot be better described than by quoting from my report, as Governor, to the Secretary of the Interior, in 1889:

"Quiet and good order are everywhere prevalent in the Territory. During my first experience in New Mexico as Chief Justice, in 1879, the advancing railroads were bringing an influx of the violent and the vicious into the Territory, from which it suffered for several years. The native population, however, was law-abiding and respectful to authority and chargeable with but few crimes. Ten years have wrought a great change. The horde that followed the railroad has passed on to other lands, only leaving a few representatives in our Penitentiary. The desperado and the 'bold bad man' have disappeared. No more quiet or safe community is to be found in the

whole land. A recent occurrence presents a strong illustration of this peaceful condition. The county of Lincoln contains over 26,500 square miles and exceeds in area four of the New England States, with New Jersey and Delaware added. Its sheriff is an efficient officer, who would let no criminal escape. I visited that county during last July and examined its jail. It was empty! There was not a single man undergoing imprisonment there, nor one in confinement awaiting trial! I submit that no similar area in the whole country can show such a record as that."

It appears, then, that none of the conditions exist which would justify a continued territorial condition, and we accordingly demand Statehood as a right. The Territory is "ripe" for it.

L. BRADFORD PRINCE.

II. ARIZONA.

BY EX-GOVERNOR JOHN N. IRWIN.

THE Territory of Arizona is knocking at the door of Congress and asks admission into the Union of States. The condition of a Territory is dependence upon the National Government. That of a State is independence in all things excepting when a constitutional limitation is imposed. A Territory is in vassalage. A State is in equality. A Territory is a child under tutelage. A State is a full grown man with no master. A State governs itself, elects its own officers and enacts its own laws. A territory is governed by officials appointed by the President of the United States, and in the past these officers have usually been selected from the older States and have had little or no knowledge of the people or of the country they are sent to rule.

A territorial legislature can, it is true, enact laws, but these laws are subject to the approval or disapproval of Congress, which knows little and cares less about the needs of a region hundreds of miles away. A Territory has no vote in Congress and no voice in the election of a President. A citizen of a territory is a citizen of the United States, but because he has crossed an imaginary line he has lost the privileges held by other citizens who remain in the States. A Territory is taxed, but has no representation. Its existence is an anomaly and as soon as it can fulfil the conditions it should be received into the Union and given all the rights and privileges of Statehood. These conditions are: (1) A people intelligent enough to sustain a State Government. (2) A population numerous enough to sustain a State Govern-

ment. (3) Financial strength and resources sufficient to sustain a State Government.

In intelligence and education the people of Arizona will compare favorably with those of any State in the Union. They are largely American, only about eight thousand being of Mexican birth and parentage. They are young, enthusiastic and enterprising, the men having for the most part come from the older States to better their condition in the far West and to hew out fortunes and to build States.

Bribery and kindred scandals are unknown in Arizona and the laws are honestly passed and justly administered. As yet the power of corporations in legislative matters is unknown and the laws are intelligent, humane and suited to the wants of the people. In education, too, Arizona is abreast of the age. It has a splendid system of public schools and at school elections all taxpayers and all parents or guardians of children of school age are entitled to vote without distinction of sex. Every child in the territory can receive a free education, and if too poor to obtain text-books the school district must furnish them free of cost. In these schools no religious tests of any kind are permitted either as to teacher or pupil, and sectarian instruction is absolutely forbidden. Teachers are paid from $90 to $125 per month. The counties levy a school tax of seventy-five cents upon each $100 of assessed property and add to the amount thus raised the money derived from certain licenses, fines and penalties, while each school district which is two miles in extent and includes at least ten children is entitled to an annual allowance of $400. And this system of schools is sustained entirely by the people of the Territory, with no assistance from the national government excepting a small annual payment for the benefit of the university at Tucson. Arizona has also a fine asylum for the insane and a penitentiary, both built and maintained by territorial funds.

The last census gave Arizona a population of 59,620, but the territory undoubtedly now contains more than 70,000 people. Its superb winter climate has induced many northern and eastern people who are in search of mild winters to settle in its valleys, while the development of its mines and its adaptability for grazing, farming and fruit culture have been factors in bringing many people to make their homes within its borders.

For admission into the Union no certain population is requisite.

The table below shows the population of each Territory by the census preceding its admission as a State.

Tennessee	35,691	California	92,597
Ohio	43,365	Minnesota	6,077
Louisiana	76,556	Oregon	13,294
Indiana	24,530	Kansas	107,206
Mississippi	40,353	Nevada	6,857
Alabama	*	Nebraska	28,841
Missouri	66,557	Colorado	39,864
Arkansas	30,388	†North Dakota	328,808
Michigan	31,639	†South Dakota	182,919
Florida	54,477	Washington	75,116
Iowa	43,112	Montana	39,159
Wisconsin	30,945	Idaho	84,385
Illinois	12,282	Wyoming	60,705

* Include with Mississippi.
† By census of 1890. In 1880 the population of both Dakotas was 135,177.

It will be seen that Arizona has a population sufficient for admission and has more people now than had two-thirds of the Territories at the date they became States.

The people of Arizona understand the spirit of American institutions and are much better fitted for self-government and for taking part in the choice of a President, Senators and Representatives than the majority of voters in New York and other large cities. In fact, as against the voters pouring into our ports from Europe, ignorant of our institutions, our customs, our laws, and even of our language—the almost purely American territory of Arizona should be admitted into the Union as a self-preserving counterbalance.

The valuation of property in the Territory for taxation is given at $28,000,000, but this sum represents only about one-third of the true value. Land is taxed on an average value of $1.41 per acre, horses at $23 each, mules at $29, and cattle at $7 per head. All other property is placed upon the same low plane of valuation. The average rate of taxation approximates $3 on each $100—80 cents of which is for territorial uses. Wyoming and Idaho when admitted had valuations for taxable purposes of $31,000,000 and $28,000,000, respectively, and Arizona is by nature and development richer and more productive than either Wyoming, Idaho or Montana. Its debt is about $800,000, and its credit is so good that it has been able to sell its bonds bearing five per cent. interest at par. Never in its history has the territory made a default on either the principal or interest of its debt.

When thoroughly prospected, Arizona will be found one of the richest sub-divisions of the Union in precious metals. Its mountains are full not only of precious metals, but of the finest beds

of onyx, and immense quarries of splendid building sandstone. The mines have, so far, been merely scratched, and yet the mineral product last year was:

Copper	$4,500,000
Gold	3,000,000
Silver	2,200,000
Total	$9,700,000

In live stock the Territory has a valuation of $8,000,000. It grazes over 700,000 cattle and nearly a million sheep, and both these great interests are growing larger every year. The wool clip is estimated at 2,500,000 pounds and this industry is very prosperous and profitable, as the mild winters make it a paradise for sheep.

The land when cultivated under a system of irrigation is as fertile as the valley of the Nile. Every cereal known in the rainfall States can be grown, and in addition the semi-tropical fruits reach perfection. The oranges and lemons produced in the valleys of the Salt and Lower Gila rivers are as perfect as those from Florida and Southern California and ripen from four to six weeks earlier. All the citrus and deciduous fruits can be easily and cheaply grown, while for ordinary grain or grass farming the valleys all over the Territory cannot be surpassed in the United States.

Under the 512 miles of irrigating canals now constructed and in operation, 343,000 acres of land have been reclaimed and 1,730,000 are capable of reclamation. With proper laws upon the subject of water storage, it is estimated that 24,000,000 acres of fertile and productive land can be placed in the hands of the farmer and fruit grower. The pine forests of the Territory cover 1,750,000 acres, or about 2,700 square miles. The total quantity fit to be turned into lumber is 10,000,000,000 feet.

The Territory has 1,074 miles of railroad in operation, crossing it from east to west in both its northern and southern sections. A new road is now being built that will join the Atlantic & Pacific road in the north to the Southern Pacific in the south. The Indians are confined to reservations in the southeastern portion of the Territory and are now entirely harmless.

The political complexion of Arizona is at present Democratic, but party lines have never been drawn as in the States, and it is doubtful which party would be dominant under the new conditions

arising from Statehood. Should a Republican Senate pass the bill of admission already enacted by the House of Representatives and should the bill be signed by a Republican President the new State would be very close politically. If President Harrison in addition to signing the bill should at the same time proclaim an amnesty to the members of the Mormon church now under sentence for violation of the laws against polygamy, the Republicans of the Territory would have a fair chance of electing the new Legislature and securing two United States Senators. The Mormons comprise about one-seventh of the population and are on the whole a respectable and law-abiding element.

Arizona should be made a State because it meets all the requirements of Statehood. The Territory has the population to make a State, and the resources to maintain a State. To keep it any longer in its present condition of tutelage and leading strings would be not only a violation of the American idea of home rule but also a great political blunder. The objections made to the admission of Arizona to statehood are that its population is not sufficient and that its resources are not adequate ; and hence that it ought not to have as much political power in the United States Senate as the older and more populous States ; and also that its population is largely of Mexican birth.

The answer to the first objection is, that by precedent its population is more than sufficient ; to the second it need only be replied that those who put forward this objection are utterly ignorant of Arizona and its great resources ; to the third the obvious answer is that the objection, if one it be, has been made against the admission of every new State and that it is obviated by the fact that the House of Representatives stands for the people and the Senate for the political divisions known as States ; while to the last it may be said that the Mexican population is American by education, absorption and surroundings, and that more ignorance is naturalized, more crime sworn into citizenship, and more unfitness made into voters in New York and Chicago every year than there is in the entire Mexican vote of Arizona.

JOHN N. IRWIN.

ENGLAND IN THE ORIENT.

BY PROFESSOR ARMINIUS VAMBÉRY.

As a result of the great social and political transformation to which the Asiatic world was subjected more than a century ago, man in the Orient has already divested himself of many peculiarities, habits, and customs, known under the generic name of *Asiatism*, and is on the eve of abandoning those ideas and views which were formerly believed to be inseparable from his nature and from the climatic conditions of his home. An extraordinary movement has taken place among the Asiatics, from Japan to the shores of the Adriatic, and from the banks of the Lena to the Indian Archipelago. In searching for the reasons of this striking change in a vast portion of our fellowmen, we are apt to put forward "Western civilization, and the all-pervading spirit of the modern world" as the chief cause of the phenomenon, but as the nations constituting the West differ greatly in their political, social and ethnical conditions, we are well justified in asking: Which of the Western nations has contributed the most towards civilizing the East, and upon which of them can we look as the potent agent and zealous apostle of our culture in the future?

This question has often been asked me since my return from the various countries of Mohammedan Asia, and, when I have answered that the English or the Anglo-Saxon race in general has proved to be the best fitted for the propagation of modern ideas, I have been set down as a critic with a special bias for the English-speaking race, and as one who finds nothing to blame in that fraction of the Western world. My criticisms, however, are based upon facts, and upon a long-standing intimate connection with Turks, Persians, Tartars, Afghans, and Hindus on the one hand, and with English and Americans on the other.

As to the facts, I may cite, before all, the astounding success England's civilizing efforts have hitherto met in India—that very hotbed of Asiatic opinions and notions, and of all the vices, abuses and shortcomings for which we have to blame the Western portion of the Eastern World. There, where centuries ago mankind was languishing under the most cruel tyranny, where life and property were at the mercy of ruthless despots and autocrats, and where blind superstition and gross ignorance furthered oppression and injustice—we now find security, prosperity, justice and enlightenment continually spreading and causing a total change in the cultural and intellectual condition of that vast country. Since 1856 the cultivated area has increased by fifty per cent. in thinly peopled districts like Burma and Assam; by thirty to sixty per cent. in the Central Provinces, Berar and parts of Bombay; and by twenty per cent. in the thickly peopled provinces of Oudh, so that the gross agricultural yield in India is calculated to have doubled since 1858.

As to public instruction, recent statistics show that there are 128 colleges and college departments with 13,614 undergraduates on the rolls, and 133,410 schools with 3,476,194 scholars. In the secondary schools there were 417,000 boys and 27,000 girls. There are also five universities, while the medical colleges are turning out numbers of well-trained native practitioners, and even women doctors are now beginning to practise. Normal schools are training teachers, and engineering and other technical schools are increasing in numbers. The expenditure on education in 1887 was £2,637,000, an outlay which has been since considerably increased. In reference to the material progress we may mention that in 1889 15,200 miles of railway were in operation, 103,000,000 passengers and 22,000,000 tons of goods having been carried during the year. There were 31,895 miles of telegraph, over which 2,750,000 messages were sent, while the area irrigated by canals was 10,630,000 acres. Similar progress is to be seen in trade, and should we be inclined to record the various improvements effected in the different branches of administration, as well as the mental advance noticeable in all classes of that huge motley population of Hindustan, volumes might be filled. We may, therefore, safely state that the English have been able to divert the thoroughly Asiatic

mind of the Hindus into grooves of European thought—nay, into the British manner of thought and action, so much so that a great German statesman, struck by this phenomenon, quite unparalleled in the history of mankind, rightly remarked: "If the British lose Shakespeare and Milton and every other writer who has made their name illustrious throughout the world, the justice and ability with which they have administered India will be an imperishable memorial of their nation."

From India we might well turn to Egypt. Here, too, we see order, security and justice spreading amongst a formerly oppressed and down-trodden population. The fellah enjoys an epoch of welfare and happiness he never knew under the rule of his co-religionist princes; in fact, he will now learn to appreciate the fabulous treasures of his native soil, and, above all, he will perceive that difference of creed and color has nothing to do with the capacity and honesty of a government. It is useless to deny that British rule has done more in a few years for the Nile country than whole centuries of the rule of former princes. And if we look to Eastern Asia we cannot fail to perceive that all the changes wrought there in the social, political and economical conditions of Japan, China and Siam are mainly due to the influence of England and America. It is the Anglo-Saxon spirit which pervades all the reforms and innovations. Anglo-American enterprise has aroused the formerly sluggish Orientals to activity, and the language of Shakespeare and of Milton is the tie which binds the Eastern Asiatic to the West. The members of the Austro-Hungarian embassy to the imperial court of Tokio were obliged to use English in their conversation with the Emperor, whilst the officers sent from Japan to the Sultan of Turkey could only make themselves understood through the assistance of English-speaking interpreters, for in the East French has ceased to be the language of diplomacy.

In the face of these undeniable facts we are well entitled to ask: What is the reason that the English have succeeded so splendidly in their work of reform in Asia, and how can they perpetuate their rule over vast multitudes far away from their insular home? The answer is very plain. Like the rest of mortals, Britons or Americans do not possess superhuman or miraculous powers; all their astounding success is simply the outcome of those ethnical, political and moral qualities, through which they

have distanced other European nations, and by which they very naturally over-awe Asiatics. An eminently strong individuality, fostered by a liberal political constitution, and by the spirit of freedom, has at all times encouraged their spirit of enterprise; stimulated them to acts of daring, and made them persevering and courageous under the most critical circumstances or the greatest dangers. The quiet temper and the indifference so frequently shown by a single English traveller amidst the hootings and clamorous behavior of the Oriental mob, by which he finds himself surrounded in the populous bazaars of Eastern towns, offers an excellent *pendant* to the attitude adopted by the English Trading Company in India on their first appearance on the coast of Bengal. Surrounded, pushed, threatened and attacked on all sides, the British troops valiantly held their own against the far more numerous armies of the Moguls, until the latter, overawed by the courage, tenacity and perseverance of the intruding foreigner, became gradually accustomed to the uncalled-for visitor, and even submitted to him. Next to this ranks the gravity and calmness with which the Englishman appears amongst Asiatics, who hate levity of character, and who are particularly inspired with respect for a man of dignified manner and serious demeanor. This quality of the English, degenerating, alas! very often into coldness and haughtiness—particularly in the case of the half educated—may well prevent a mutual *rapprochement* between the conqueror and the conquered, and it has also in many cases essentially injured the friendly relations of both. On this account the Russian conqueror is ahead of the English, for the former, being himself an Asiatic, will much more readily entertain a close and intimate relation with Orientals than will the Briton of higher education, who enters his field of Asiatic enterprise quite fresh from Oxford or Cambridge. It would be not only useless but culpable to disregard this national error, to which must be ascribed more than one calamity which has befallen the English in the East.

On the other hand we ought not to conceal from ourselves the fact that an Oriental is accustomed to respect a stern master; in fact, the ruler in whom he discovers an easy-going mind and puerile habits will never be able to influence his character or to bring him round to obedience. According to Oriental notions, gravity of character and sense of justice are qualities inseparable from each other;

the Oriental patiently bears the one in order to enjoy the benefits of the other, and consequently he finds it quite natural that the rule of his English master is, above all, just and equitable, and that he never has to apprehend any unfair treatment. It is the relation between the father and his grown-up children which serves as a bond between the English ruler and his Asiatic subjects, and if this ruler, in fulfilling his paternal duties, shows himself truly liberal and generous, as the English do, owing to their innate sense of liberty and fair play—and Oriental rulers never do or did—then the mutual understanding must unavoidably result in those happy relations which we find to-day between Great Britain and her Asiatic subjects, in whose loyalty and contentment lies the most eloquent proof of the superiority and the solidity of British rule in Asia.

Superficial critics, men unacquainted with the real spirit of the East, have frequently declared that English rule and English views, representing the highest degree of Western civilization, must be too strange to the totally different notions of mankind in Asia, and that consequently British institutions must be unpalatable to the genuine Asiatic. Although I have heard this remark from many statesmen and eminent philosophers of our day, it is nevertheless a fallacy which needs refutation, for no Asiatic is so shortsighted as not to perceive the good qualities of the English rule compared with the disorderly, rapacious and despotic government of his native princes.

Difference in religion, which with an Asiatic outweighs all possible considerations, has been and will long remain the great stumbling block in the way of a thorough appreciation of the superior qualities of the foreign conqueror, and will prevent a close contact between the ruler and the ruled, but religious tolerance—a virtue totally unknown to the Asiatic—tends to mitigate this evil. The non-interference with the religious customs and habits, nay, the respect paid by the Christian conquerors to certain rites, has particularly struck the Mohammedan portion of the Asiatic world, and furnishes an evident proof of justice on the part of the English, and if we add that the English ruler does not officially countenance the work of Christian missionaries, and that before the law all religions enjoy equal right and protection—which cannot be said either of Russia or of other Christian rulers in the East—then it will be easily understood that British rule is not

by any means oppressive to the natives of Asia, and that, having once submitted to it, they become patient and happy subjects.

It has often been said that the Asiatic, having served from time immemorial as a blind tool of despotism and tyranny, will never be able to acquire a taste for political freedom and liberty of action. Politicians on the Continent have frequently reproached England with being too liberal in her dealings with Asiatic societies and have warned the foreign ruler of India of the evil consequences and dangers which must follow. This, too, I am glad to say, is another fallacy. Liberty is a golden fruit towards which mankind, whether in Asia or in any other part of the world, has always eagerly stretched forth a hand, and those who have tasted it will certainly not readily renounce its enjoyment. The truly liberal institutions which have emanated hitherto from our Western world to the Asiatic are mostly, if not exclusively, of English or American extraction, and we have only to look at Japan and India to see that they have not fallen on barren soil, but that they have taken root and promise to thrive as well as they do in the West.

A long correspondence with Japanese and Hindus, brought up amid European surroundings, has taught me that these Oriental fellow-men of ours value highly our liberal institutions; it is not the least strange or troublesome to them to raise their heads from the dust of abject slavery, and they are sometimes even too fiery and too hasty in the path of liberalism, as proved by the Benzali Babus, who had found their political ideal in the late Mr. Bradlaugh, or by young Turkey, who delighted in Robespierre and Danton. The truly liberal spirit of government, far from being a menace or a danger, is the real stronghold of British rule in Asia, and whilst it outshines the rule of the rest of foreign conquerors in the old world, so does it afford the best guarantee of stability and duration.

ARMINIUS VAMBÉRY.

NATIONAL BANKING AND THE CLEARING-HOUSE.

BY THE HON. A. B. HEPBURN, COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

THE national banking law, at the time of its enactment, was essentially a transcript from the laws of New York and Massachusetts, with changes necessary to nationalize their provisions, together with some distinctively new features. The system was established at a time of great financial pressure (1863) to supply the monetary needs of the government, State banks having proven inadequate. United States bonds, exclusively, were made the basis for circulating notes, and thus the banks became large purchasers of bonds, and note-holders were protected beyond possibility of loss. Many important amendments have since been made, all of a restrictive character.

The affirmative action of banks, within the line of statute and common law, is left to their individual enterprise, inspired by the desire of stockholders for dividends. The function of the government is to regulate by restraining. It seeks to insure good banking by enforcing statutory prohibition against unsafe practices.

Five or more persons may organize a national bank, and receive their charter from the Comptroller of the Currency. Banks may be organized with a minimum capital of fifty thousand dollars in places of less than six thousand inhabitants, one hundred thousand dollars where the population does not exceed fifty thousand, and with two hundred thousand capital in all larger places. Banks must own United States bonds equal to one-fourth of their capital stock, if the capital does not exceed one hundred and fifty thousand, and in case it does must own not less than fifty thousand dollars of such bonds. Any national bank may acquire and assign to the United States Treasurer, bonds of the United States not

exceeding the amount of capital stock, upon which security the Comptroller issues circulating notes equal to ninety per cent. of the par of such bonds. In 1863 Congress imposed a ten per cent. tax on State-bank circulation, which was intended to and did force it out of existence.

Banks make five verified reports of condition annually, in such form as the Comptroller prescribes, upon a post-dated notice, which reports are compiled and reported to Congress, and the balance sheets published in the local press. These reports are elaborate as to balance sheet and detail, and since the books of each bank must be so kept as to furnish this information, it has an important and valuable influence in systematizing bookkeeping and unifying methods of business. The compilation of these reports reflects the course of trade and finance throughout the country, and is of great practical value to the public.

Each bank is examined at least once a year by an expert examiner, appointed by the Comptroller of the Currency and Secretary of the Treasury. The scope of examination includes compliance with the law, character and method of business, fitness of officers, valuation of assets, and ascertainment of liabilities.

National banks are restricted to a commercial banking business, cannot loan upon real estate security, and real estate holdings are limited to banking necessities and property acquired to protect the bank against loss; cannot loan upon or own their stock; are forbidden to borrow money to an amount exceeding paid-up capital; are forbidden to certify checks, except against money actually on deposit, and are forbidden to loan to any one individual, corporation or firm an amount exceeding ten per cent. of their capital.

Causes affecting a whole community, like general financial distress, repeated crop failures in one locality, may cause bank failures, but the history of bank failures and large losses, which do not result in failure, reveals as a common cause the concentration of the bank's funds in a few hands or a few interests. This prohibition seeks to distribute a bank's loans and thus reduce its risks. New York, Chicago and St. Louis are central reserve cities, and banks located therein are required to keep, in bank, a cash reserve equal to twenty-five per cent. of their net deposits. There are twenty other reserve cities, the banks in which are also required to keep a like reserve of twenty-five per cent., one-half of

which must be cash in bank and the remainder may be to their credit with a central reserve city bank, approved by the Comptroller. Banks located elsewhere are required to keep a like reserve of fifteen per cent., six per cent. of which must be in cash in bank and the balance may be with an approved bank in any reserve city. This requirement does not seek to establish a new principle in banking. Its purpose is to compel all banks to keep such reserve as conservative banks would keep in the absence of any regulation.

The percentages required are based upon the experience of conservative banks, conform to the requirements of prudence, and are designed to be so fixed that in the regular course of business a bank would as often be over as under its reserve. The reserve is not a fixed quantity, segregated from the current funds of the bank. It is there to be used when required. The statute contemplates such use, but requires its restoration in due course of business. And if, after notice from the Comptroller, it fails for thirty days to make its reserve good, the bank may be closed.

An interior bank cannot safely transact its current business with less than six per cent. of its deposits in cash on hand. And reserve city banks, with their liability to be drawn upon, "in flocks," by their correspondents, require the increased amount. Stockholders are liable to an assessment to make good an impairment of capital, and, in case of failure, are liable to assessment to an amount equal to the par of their holdings, in order to pay creditors. In case of failure a receiver is appointed by the Comptroller. All moneys are paid into the United States Treasury, and dividends paid by the Comptroller. This method has proven very economical and expeditious in comparison with the system of appointing receivers by the courts, which prevails in several States.

I have briefly noted the distinguishing features of the national system. The National Bank Act has stood as a legislative model for the various States, and several have copied its provisions. But there is nothing approximating uniformity in the different States. The greatest diversity exists. Few States require banks of discount and deposit to keep a reserve or limit the amount of loans to single individuals, corporations, or firms, or forbid loans upon real estate, or stock of the bank, or forbid over-certification, or make stockholders liable to assessment for the payment of cred-

itors. Many have no system of examinations, many require less frequent reports of condition—quarterly or semi-annually—and less complete in form and detail than in the national system.

Some States have excellent systems, like New York. Kansas has a very complete law, recently enacted. In thirteen States State banks are prohibited from issuing circulating notes. In fifteen the statute is silent upon the subject. Many require securities, ranging from U. S. bonds to real estate, as a basis for circulation, and some permit circulation, without security, to an amount exceeding the capital stock. In one, an individual, by complying with the statute, becomes an "Individual Banker," possessing all the powers of a corporate bank, including that of issuing circulating notes. Trust companies form an important part of State banking institutions, enjoy unusual privileges, and have had marvellous growth in our cities. The city of Boston has no State banks, but many trust companies. New York's and Philadelphia's trust companies far surpass their State banks in volume of business and aggregate of resources. They are not allowed to issue circulating notes, and are not authorized to "discount bills," but may loan upon them or buy them. They exercise all the other usual functions of banks, and, in addition, may act as register and transfer agents for corporations, fiscal agents for municipalities; may accept and execute any trust of any kind, created by a corporation or individual, or by order of court. They pay interest upon deposits subject to check, and are strong competitors of savings' banks, as well as banks of discount. They are not required to keep reserve, and many of them keep no cash, but deposit with and pay by check upon their clearing-house bank.

In New York, savings banks can only invest in United States bonds, New York State bonds, municipal bonds within the State of New York, and bonds and mortgages. In all other States the range is much wider, including railroad and corporation bonds, and, in many, bills receivable. Most savings banks are mutual, but many have capital stock, and many do a commercial bank business.

The banking laws and systems of the several States are so different that comparison between the National and State systems is exceedingly difficult. Their relative importance is tersely expressed by the following table.

Total resources,	3,788 National banks, October 31, 1892	$3,510,094,897
" "	3,191 State banks, July 1, 1892	1,040,697,731
" "	168 Loan and Trust companies, July 1, 1892	600,244,908
" "	1,059 Savings banks, July 1, 1892	1,964,044,861
" "	1,161 Private banks, July 1, 1892	146,661,673

The currency question at the present time presents a triangular aspect. The government has in circulation five different kinds of paper money—gold certificates, silver certificates, greenback certificates, greenback and treasury notes—aggregating $899,562,711. The national banks have in circulation $174,404,424, and now comes the proposition, formidable from the indorsement it has received, to restore circulation to State banks. Since 1878 the silver interests have dominated the councils of the nation. Under the Bland act silver was purchased, and $378,166,793 standard dollars coined. They accumulated in the Treasury, where their uselessness would doubtless have compelled the repeal of the act had they not been coaxed into circulation by means of a paper proxy—silver certificates.

In 1890, when the high rate of interest which prevailed in the money centres of the world indicated a scarcity of money and justified an increase in the circulating medium, a proposition was made to allow national banks to issue circulation to the par of their bond deposits. This proposition was absolutely free from criticism, and would have added (July 14, 1890) $14,412,190 to the circulation, almost immediately. And yet this silver interest barred the way and insisted that no relief should come except it came through silver. Free coinage was the panacea demanded; compromise gave us the present law, under whose provisions 129,879,444 ounces of silver have been purchased and $124,735,665 Treasury notes issued. This silver has depreciated upon the hands of the Government $14,987,545. That is the bounty paid to the silver industry.

According to the late Mr. Blaine the "tariff is enlightened selfishness." If enlightenment is in proportion to selfishness, then silver advocates stand preëminent.

The silver industry is entitled to no bounty. The policy of the Government, in purchasing a commodity which it does not want, for the sole purpose of putting into circulation as money the obligations given therefor, cannot be justified. An equally safe and more elastic currency can be otherwise provided.

The operations of the act of 1890 have involved the Government in demonstrable loss and threaten to involve financial dis-

aster. The possibility of a premium upon gold, and consequent contraction of the currency by the amount of gold in circulation, holds enterprise in fetters, embarrasses trade and depreciates our securities in the markets of the world. The monometallists this country needs to fear are those who contemplate this prospect with equanimity, who would make merchandise of gold and make silver our basis of value. There is not a business interest that would not be relieved, not an industry that would not be strengthened, if the Government would cease these silver purchases and cease to issue currency.

The cloud that obscures the sunshine of prosperity has a silver substance, instead of a silver lining. National bank currency is flippantly condemned upon the ground that it is based upon the national debt, which is about to be extinguished, and hence the currency must cease to exist. This position is based upon three assumptions, by no means warranted: First, that no currency can be secure except it be based upon a deposit of stocks and bonds; second, that the United States debt will presently cease to exist; third, that when the national debt is paid and cancelled no other securities will exist available for the purpose.

If the banking experience of the several States prior to the war affords no example of a successful currency system, it nevertheless furnishes data sufficient to show what might have been. From this experience the national banking system was evolved. The practicability of the safety fund principle, when confined in its application to circulating notes and the issue of such notes sufficiently guarded, was fairly demonstrated. The perfect statistical information furnished by the national bank system more clearly demonstrates the feasibility of protecting bill-holders without bonds as security, if that alternative becomes necessary.

Since the organization of the national bank system, and prior to November 1, 1892, 181 banks have failed. All of these paid noteholders in full out of the proceeds of the United States bonds deposited to secure the same; 39 paid creditors in full; 6 paid principal and part of the interest, and 13 principal but no interest; 110 have been finally closed, and 16 are virtually closed. Of those finally closed, only 33 failed to pay dividends to creditors, equal in amount to their circulation, in addition to redeeming their notes.

The total circulation of these 33 banks was $3,310,529, their total dividends were $2,095,678. The total circulation of all these

failed banks was $16,840,850. The total cost to the government, from all sources, of the national bank system has been $14,535,000. The total tax collected from the banks, upon circulation alone, being at the rate of one per cent. per annum, was, June 30, 1892, $72,635,000. Hence from this tax alone the government could have assumed and redeemed all bills of all failed national banks, recouped all expenses and still have a net surplus of $41,209,150. An annual tax of two-fifths of one per cent., upon circulation would have defrayed all cost, and redeemed all notes of all failed banks.

In the light of the foregoing statistics it is probable that most banks would, without bonds as security, pay enough to redeem their circulating notes. Hence the Government, fortifying itself by means of a small tax, could safely assume the immediate redemption of the notes of failed banks, and by making itself a preferred creditor, recoup itself from the bank's assets.

But a safety fund which compels the strong banks to redeem the notes of the weaker ones is essentially unjust. The safety fund principle can be combined with security for circulation with excellent results. Let a fund be contributed by a uniform tax upon all banks, and paid into the Treasury of the United States, available for the immediate redemption of the notes of failed banks. Give this fund a prior lien upon the assets and stockholders' liability of such banks for the advances made, less the amounts contributed to such safety fund by such banks. There should be a provision, also, that any bank going into liquidation should only be required to deposit with the Treasurer of the United States a sum equal to its outstanding circulation, less the amount contributed by such bank to such fund. Such a fund would involve no injustice to banks, would be a guarantee of the immediate redemption of failed bank notes, and would avoid the criticism of the want of convertibility of other than United States bonds as a basis for circulation. The necessary legislation could be easily engrafted upon the present provisions of the National Bank Act.

As to the second assumption: public revenue, viewed in the light of public expenditures and the trend of public opinion upon the subject of taxation, affords no prospect of the reduction of the public debt by bond purchases in the immediate future. There is little probability of anticipating the maturity of the

four per cent. bonds, and every indication that they will be continued after they do mature—July 1, 1907.

As to the third assumption: When the best is removed, of necessity, the second best is promoted and becomes best.

United States bonds command the highest premium in proportion to interest paid, yield the lowest rate of interest to an investor, fluctuate least, are most readily convertible into cash, and from the point of safety are the best securities of the present time. But to assume that when they cease to exist the country will be bereft of securities possessing stability and convertibility, suitable as a basis for circulation, is unwarranted. With $559,589,200 of four per cent. bonds, with fourteen years to run, this question, What other bonds can be substituted? is not a burning one. Any change in the basis of circulation, whenever made, should be predicated upon the extinction or unavailability of these bonds. The needs of these banks enabled the Government (September 1, 1891) to continue $25,364,500 of four and one-half per cent. bonds at the low rate of two per cent., at the pleasure of the Government, while the four per cent. bonds netted an investor, at the same date, 2.7 per cent. Thus the banks in effect are contributing to the Government a saving in interest of seven-tenths of one per cent. annually upon $25,364,500, or $177,551.50.

It was demonstrated in the last annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency that had the 4 per cent. bond issue been refunded into 2 per cent. bonds on October 31, at current market value, it would have resulted in a saving to the Government of $67,161,551.47. A large portion of such bonds could undoubtedly be so exchanged. It is argued that this would increase the public debt. Certainly not. The accruing interest is as much a part of the debt as the principal. It would increase the principal, but in a greater degree reduce the interest and result in a large net saving. This would furnish ample bonds, selling at par, as a basis for circulation, and by allowing circulation equal to the par of bonds it would remove all force from the criticism that parties organizing new banks are compelled to tie up their capital by purchasing high-priced securities equal to one-fourth their capital stock.

No bank is required to own more than fifty thousand dollars in U. S. bonds, and, all expenses considered, circulation nets more than 6 per cent. Hence the above criticism has little

force, except as to small banks in new places, and little even then.

In order to keep their funds profitably employed banks are becoming large owners of investment securities. On December 9 they owned $153,648,180.71 of investment securities, in addition to $185,918,850 in U. S. bonds. The ownership of bonds is no hardship. It is the heavy tax and restricted issue and high premium that are unjust. Security for circulation compels the conservative investment of enough funds to absolutely protect bill-holders and leave the remaining assets for the protection of general creditors.

State bank circulation is advocated so as to give each locality an abundant supply of money. The profit of bank circulation depends upon the time it remains outstanding. It is useless to the public and profitless to the banks, so long as it remains in the bank vaults. As often as it is received and credited to a depositor, so often is it redeemed. Its use and profit are inconsistent with the ideal of a local currency.

In ante-bellum times banks uniformly discriminated in favor of the borrower, who wanted funds to use at a distance. State bank bills, if permitted to issue, must be accepted as money, must pass current with the business community, because the greater portion of the community are not in condition to discriminate between the strong and the weak, and of necessity cannot be; also because of competition—a fear that refusal may not be well founded and result in driving away business. Such bills would circulate freely in normal times, when credit is freely extended, would perform the function of money and pay debts; but in times of financial reverses, the general distrust that withholds credit would extend to them, and instead of being regarded as money, holders would be seeking their redemption; instead of paying debts, their own payment would be demanded. In times of prosperity they would add to the boom; in times of adversity they would lose their money power and add to the distress.

Why should Congress delegate the question of bank circulation to the forty-four sovereignties that constitute the United States, with diverse laws, systems, and supervision? Confusion, uncertainty, want of information and inability to procure information must ensue. It is axiomatic that one authority, with central supervision and control, can accomplish better re-

sults. You cannot localize money in the United States. The value of a currency depends upon the extent of country in which it possesses debt-paying power. State lines are all powerful in determining where a man shall vote and pay his taxes, but in determining the course of commerce and fixing the currency that moves that commerce, they should have no effect. The United States is a nation, in a commercial sense preëminently so, with one interest and one destiny, and its material interests will be best subserved by but one currency.

The greenbacks are a forced loan, bearing no interest, which must some day be paid. Our silver currency is non-elastic and certainly non-profitable. State-bank circulation is condemned alike by reason and experience.

The national-bank circulation is commended alike by reason and experience. Proper legislation could easily add elasticity to its present qualities and render it adequate to the needs of the entire country, making it what every currency should be—sound, safe, elastic, and as good as gold. And what stands in the way of such legislation—a prejudice as old as it is unjust, a selfishness that would force a market for silver, and a clamor for more money as unwise as it is dangerous.

Carefully prepared statistics, covering widely separated periods, show that over ninety per cent. of all business transactions in the United States, accomplished through banks, are represented by credits. Less than ten per cent. involves the actual transfer of money. In the light of this fact, how apparent becomes the impossibility of furnishing a volume of money, sufficient to transact the business of the country in times of distrust when credit is refused. The mechanism of banking is so complete and its working is so thoroughly systematized that some form of credit is made to take the place of money, wherever possible, thus avoiding the risk involved in the use of money and preventing the loss of interest which such money otherwise employed would earn. A check drawn upon the First National Bank of Potsdam and deposited in the First National Bank of Canton—two adjoining towns in northern New York—would be sent to New York City for collection, a distance of four hundred miles, instead of being sent direct, a distance of ten miles. Why? Because there is no exchange between these towns, no open accounts. There is between each and New York. A

Michigan bank has occasion to remit to a bank in Missouri. It does not send money, which would involve express charges. It remits by draft upon New York, Chicago or some central city, where it has a credit balance, which costs only postage. Thus the bulk of all the banking transactions of the country flow into our larger cities, constitute a part of the Clearing-House exchanges, are subject to every possible offset, and the actual money remittances from one locality to another are minimized. The Clearing-House affords the most remarkable instance of the extent to which a simple device of bookkeeping can minimize the use of money.

In our smaller cities it is the custom of banks to send all claims payable at other banks in the same place, by runners or messengers to such banks for payment. In such manner are their exchanges consummated, and in such cases the payment of these claims represents a money transaction. In our larger cities, in order to save time and labor and avoid the risk attendant upon the transporting of money about the streets, and minimize the amount of actual money required to adjust the exchanges, clearing-house associations have been established, wherein each bank is credited with what claims it has against the other members of the association, and debited with the amount that each of the other members of the association hold against it. The balance only is paid or received in money. Thus each bank adjusts its day's exchanges, as though all transactions were with one bank instead of with the many banks which constitute the other members of the association. The mechanism is simple. The claims against each bank are placed in separate envelopes and listed on the outside. Each bank has a desk in the Clearing-House, and is represented by a delivery clerk and a settling clerk. The delivery clerk upon arrival hands to the Manager a ticket showing the total amount of exchange brought. This amount is immediately credited upon the Clearing-House balance sheet.

All clerks must be at their desk at ten o'clock. Any delinquent bank is fined. At the tap of the bell the procession of delivery clerks moves in order, each delivering his exchanges and each settling clerk receiving and receipting therefor. The settling clerk then foots the exchanges he has received from the other banks and sends to the manager a ticket, showing the amount. Each bank is debited the amount thus received and

the total credits and total debits balance. If they do not, after the expiration of fifteen minutes, the time allowed for the consummation of this work, any bank found in error is fined.

At 1:30 P. M. the banks are again represented at the Clearing-House, and either pay or receive in money their debit or credit balances. The payments just balance the receipts, and of all the millions that pass through the Clearing-House each day, nothing remains at the close of banking hours.

There are fifty-seven clearing-house cities in the United States. Their aggregate exchanges last year were $61,017,839,067 and yet the transaction of this enormous volume of business was accomplished with the use of $4,881,777,289 in money, such being the total balance actually paid.

A. B. HEPBURN.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXXVII.

APRIL, 1893.

CHARGES AT THE WORLD'S FAIR.

BY THE DIRECTOR GENERAL, GEORGE R. DAVIS.

WILL visitors to the World's Columbian Exposition be able to live comfortably and at reasonable rates during their stay in Chicago?

The question is suggested by the Editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, and the recent and very general agitation of the subject justifies as definite answer as can be made at this time. It may be well to emphasize at the outset the peculiar conditions of the problem. No international exposition has ever been projected on such a scale as the Columbian Exposition. It may be said without exaggeration that no peaceful undertaking has ever attracted such widespread attention.

The transportation lines of this country expect such a movement towards Chicago from May 1 to October 30 of this year, as has never been paralleled. Their calculations are based on the best possible information from innumerable local agencies covering this and foreign countries. Under favorable conditions and in the absence of any great national calamity the most conservative estimates place the influx of strangers at about fifty thousand a day, or six millions for the six months of the Exposition. The estimates are, of course, purely speculative. Their value depends largely upon the climatic conditions during the season; upon prevailing charges for transportation; and, perhaps most of

Copyright, 1893, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

all, upon the attitude of those people who will furnish accommodations for the visiting public in Chicago.

By the time the gates of Jackson Park are open to visitors, twenty million dollars will have been expended by the management on the magnificent buildings of the Exposition, the adornment of the grounds, foreign and domestic promotion and the general administration of the Fair. This sum does not include any of the amounts paid out by foreign countries for their buildings, the expenditures for State buildings, or the cost of any of the exhibits or the expense of their installation. It represents only the amount expended under authority of the management.

The Exposition offers but two sources of income to those who have advanced this vast sum to prepare the Fair for the coming of visitors. One is the gate receipts, and the other, a percentage from concessions and special privileges for the sale of merchandise on the grounds. It must be apparent, therefore, that those most deeply concerned in the success of the undertaking are interested in keeping visitors in the city as long as possible, in enabling them to visit the Exposition many times, and in protecting them from extortion on the part of landlords and others. Ordinary business sagacity would suggest the advantages of protracting the stay of visitors rather than hastening their departure by a system of overcharging.

As early as November, 1890, if the reader will pardon a reference to one of my official acts, I directed attention to the advisability of organizing a bureau of protection and public comfort, the special duty of which, as the title indicates, would be to furnish strangers with accurate information in regard to desirable living quarters at reasonable terms. The management at that early day foresaw the possible discomfort to visitors and the consequent loss of patronage. This bureau has been organized. In general, its purpose is to ascertain what the hotel and rooming facilities of the city are, and what the cost of living will be. In furtherance of this plan, the bureau has undertaken to contract in advance with the landlords for such facilities as may be demanded by incoming visitors. The bureau is only an intermediary, furnishing both lessee and lessor a guarantee of financial responsibility and acting as a temporary balance-wheel to prevent any sudden disarrangement of the machinery that will be set in motion to supply

the wants of an extraordinary assemblage of strangers within the municipal limits.

The chief of this bureau occupied a similar relation to the Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia. From him I learn that the bureau has already registered hotels and rooms with a capacity of some fifteen thousand people daily, the list including none of the big hotels down town, or large structures in course of erection within a short distance of the Exposition grounds. The accommodations registered include only the better class of quarters, and are within limits bounded by North Avenue on the north and by Seventy-ninth Street on the south, the farthest point being within less than an hour's ride and the nearest within a short distance of the grounds. The average scale of prices scheduled ranges from $1.36 per day for a single room occupied by one person to $5.50 for large single apartments occupied by four persons. The prices quoted may be taken as a fair basis of the charges now contemplated by the householders, who expect the Exposition attendance to be a source of revenue.

Estimates believed to be reliable place the hotel capacity of the city at one hundred and thirty-five thousand guests, excluding the prominent down-town hostelries, which have an emergency capacity for at least ten thousand people. And none of these estimates takes into account the enormous capacity of the temporary hotels and other places in course of construction. Personal investigation made by experts for use in this connection shows that there are hotels enough built and in construction within a radius of a mile from the Exposition to lodge at least fifty thousand people every day. Religious organizations, clubs, coöperative associations, dormitory associations and affiliated bodies of great numerical strength have undertaken to solve the question of suitable accommodations for visitors. Bearing in mind these extensive arrangements for the reception of transient visitors it may be of value to consider the probable number of such visitors, taking such data for comparison as are offered by the Centennial Exposition in 1876 and the Paris Exposition in 1889.

The average daily attendance at the Centennial was 62,333; the largest attendance was 274,919; the smallest 12,720. The daily average at Paris was 130,000; the largest single day's admissions, 400,000. While the circumstances and con-

ditions surrounding the Columbian Exposition differ materially from those of either the Centennial or Paris exhibition, the divergence is not great enough to affect a very clear conclusion from the figures given. The unavoidable inference drawn from every international fair is this: The attendance is very largely drawn from the population within a limited radius from the site of the exposition. Thus, for instance, the statistics of the Paris Exhibition show that on days when the attendance averaged 250,000, at least 190,000 came from Paris and its environs.

Allowing for the difference in national habits which makes the American regard a trip from San Francisco to Chicago with greater readiness than the Frenchman does a journey to Berlin; allowing, too, for the unlimited stimulus to travel given by the excursion system planned by the railroads of this country for the coming event—taking every possible factor into account, it seems hardly possible that more than an average of two hundred thousand non-residents will be in Chicago at any one time during the Exposition. Assuming, then, that two hundred thousand will be the largest average of strangers needing food and lodging in the city, no one familiar with the situation would hesitate to declare that the ordinary rule of supply and demand will prevail throughout the six months and that the price of living will be as reasonable as could be expected.

I have mentioned a number of associations that have been projected to insure cheap and comfortable living apartments for visitors. Let me call special attention to one of these as illustrating the plan and purposes of the others. The Woman's Dormitory Association was organized months ago by a number of the foremost women of Chicago. Its object is to furnish neat, convenient, and cheap living rooms for industrial women and others who perhaps would not be able to reap the benefits of the Fair if compelled to live in hotels during their stay in the city. The capital stock of this company was divided into shares of ten dollars each. The shares are not subject to assessment. The woman who buys a share of this stock exchanges it for an order on the association for apartments in the dormitory, where she is charged at the rate of forty cents a day for lodging. In other words, each share of stock entitles the holder to live twenty-five days in the hotel erected by this association. Of course, the rate

named does not include table service. The special purpose of this association was to enable working girls, clubs of women, teachers, and, in short, all women in moderate circumstances, to get the benefit of what we believe will be the greatest stimulus to education of the century. These shares of stock were offered for sale in every State in the Union, and in foreign countries, many of them being bought by philanthropic women who will place them in the hands of deserving girls and matrons. This dormitory will furnish living rooms for one thousand persons a day, and any deficit, at the close of the Exposition, will be borne by the ladies of this city who inaugurated the noble philanthropy. Since the Woman's Dormitory was organized and its success assured, others have been undertaken on a similar plan, one of them to accommodate families, and especially aged men and women.

I might enumerate other projects that are being fostered by the citizens of Chicago to protect their guests, but these fairly illustrate the work now being done. The sentiment of this city is overwhelmingly against any unfairness or extortion in dealing with our coming guests. I believe that the better element of our citizenship would rebuke anything like systematic extortion on the part of landlords by throwing open their residences and inviting strangers to come in. In a matter involving the honor and the pride of the city, I do not doubt that Chicago will rise to the occasion and acquit herself in a manner that will win the plaudits of the world.

Undoubtedly there will be some cases of excessive charges. Perhaps some visitors who do not stop to inquire about rates or who neglect to make contracts in advance of taking possession of their apartments will be charged unreasonably. This is not an uncommon occurrence elsewhere. But speaking of the situation in general, of the treatment the great majority of strangers will receive, I am confident that when the Exposition season is over it will be found that those visitors who exercised ordinary prudence will have no reason to complain of the treatment they received.

GEO. R. DAVIS.

BRAIN SURGERY.

BY WILLIAM A. HAMMOND, M. D., SURGEON-GENERAL U. S. ARMY (RETIRED).

AMONG the many wonderful advances made in medical science during the present half of the nineteenth century that of the successful performance of surgical operations on the human brain may properly be accorded a prominent place in the front rank, and it must also be borne in mind that that rank embraces anæsthesia, antisepsis and the germ theory of the cause and cure of disease. Any one of these is sufficient of itself to mark an era in the progress of the science and art of medicine.

Within the memory of surgeons of the present generation the idea of attempting in cold blood a surgical operation on the brain would have been reprobated as utterly unjustifiable, and as logically entitling the perpetrator either to incarceration within the walls of a lunatic asylum or those of a prison. The organ was looked upon as something almost sacred, and as not to be touched by the profane knife of the surgeon. It was regarded as being the seat not only of the mind but of the soul, and he who should have dared to desecrate this temple of the immortal essence would have had to endure the vituperation not only of those of his own profession—of whom there are always many—who stand in the way of progress, but of still more narrow-minded and unprogressive theologians.

It is not to be forgotten that some of these latter when anæsthesia was introduced into obstetrical practice thundered their anathemas from the pulpit and the press against the wicked physicians who were, as they declared, defying the Almighty, and trying to set aside the curse pronounced against Eve—"In sorrow shalt thou bring forth all the days of thy life." And to our shame we must admit that there were physicians in

those days who entertained the belief that it was good for a woman that she should suffer at such times. Happily the spirit of the age is different now, and though there still exists, and will exist till the end of the world, jealousy and ultra-conservatism in the one profession, and mental stagnation and ignorance of science in the other, the skilful, the conscientious and the bold investigator can generally manage to hold his own against all attacks whether they come from within or without.

Again, extremely exalted ideas in regard to the delicacy of the structure of the brain conjoined with the intricacy of the arrangements of its several parts, and very considerable ignorance of their functions, have tended to make surgeons exceedingly cautious, not to say terrorized, at the idea of invading its precincts even in the slightest degree. Experiments which accidents made for them did not seem to create much of an impression. Thus, persons have had their skulls fractured and have lost several tablespoonfuls of brain matter and yet have recovered. Others have had fragments of the skull driven into the brain by violence, and they have remained there, causing no subsequent inconvenience, and still others have been shot in the head and the bullets have remained encysted in the brain, while the injured person continued to go about his business with as much intelligence as he had before the wound.

Not very many years ago a strong, healthy man twenty-five years of age was engaged in ramming down a charge of powder in a rock to be blasted when an explosion took place and the tamping iron was driven through his head from the base of his skull to the vertex. In a few minutes he recovered his consciousness, was put into a cart and carried three-quarters of a mile to his residence where he got out and walked into the house. Two hours afterwards he was seen by a physician; he was then quite conscious and collected in his mind, but exhausted by an extensive hemorrhage from the hole in the top of his head. But the wound finally closed up and his recovery was complete. There was no pain in the head, but he experienced a queer feeling which he could not describe. As regards his mind he was fitful and vacillating, though obstinate as he had always been. He became very profane, never having been so before the accident. He lived twelve and a half years after the accident, and his cranium with the bar that went through it are now in the Warren Anatomical Museum

at Boston. An examination shows that the left anterior lobe of the brain had suffered severely by this terrible injury, and yet the derangement of the mental and bodily faculties was certainly not in proportion to the extensive loss of brain substance that had been suffered.

And this case is equalled if not excelled by another, and the subject of this injury is so, far as I know, still alive. In this instance a healthy and intelligent man about twenty-seven years of age was blasting coal when the charge exploded unexpectedly and an iron gas pipe that he was using was driven transversely through his head, entering just above the right eye and emerging on the opposite side near the middle of the skull. One of his fellow-miners saw him on his hands and knees struggling as if to rise. In going to the man's assistance, he placed his knee upon his chest, supported his head with one hand, and with the other withdrew the pipe. This last projected about equally on each side of the head, and much force was required for its withdrawal. Brain escaped from the anterior opening and coma and collapse supervened. In seven weeks he sat up and in one more walked about. There was no paralysis anywhere, but the movements of his right hand were somewhat impaired. Nearly a year after the accident his memory for some things was almost lost, but during the next two months there was considerable improvement.

The accident happened on May 14, 1867, and in June, 1868, the patient with the gas pipe was exhibited in the Massachusetts Medical Society. Dr. Jackson stated at the time that the man appeared to be in a good state of general health, and though his mental powers were considerably impaired there was nothing unusual in his expression nor would there be noticed, in a few minutes' conversation with him, any marked deficiency of intellect.

Such unintentional surgical operations as these, and many other similar ones, ought not to have been disregarded, and yet they seem to have created no other emotion than that of astonishment that, notwithstanding the terrible injuries inflicted on the brain, the subjects continued to live in comparatively good mental and physical health. Even after the German Hitzig, the Englishman Ferrier, and other investigators in different parts of the world had mapped out the surface of the brain, explored its interior, and demonstrated the relations of its several

centres to the sensory and motor functions of the body, there was a howl of indignation when that bold and scientific physician, Dr. Bartholow, touched with the electric needle the exposed brain of a patient and established for the first time on a human subject the functions of a cortical centre. Bartholow's experiment is now a common procedure in surgical operations on the brain when there is doubt as to the anatomical relations of the part upon which we are operating. We touch the point with a delicate needle connected with a very small galvanic battery and the muscles which derive their motor power from that region at once respond by contracting.

Many experiments of this character performed upon animals, especially monkeys, have given us quite accurate ideas of the position of the motor centres for various groups of muscles, and these, together with post-mortem examinations of the brains of persons who have died while suffering from impairment of a brain faculty have made us acquainted with the centres for speech, for vision, for hearing, and for other important ideational, sensory and motor functions.

As an example, take that of speech, a power that may be deranged by injury of that part of the brain called the speech tract, and which, strange to say, is located or at least developed, in perhaps nine hundred and ninety-nine persons out of a thousand, on the left side of the brain only. Disease or injury of this region produces the condition called aphasia, which is an impairment of the ability to recognize words when written or spoken, or the loss of the power to so use the muscles of speech as to articulate words even when these latter are recognized when written or spoken. The very idea of language is therefore destroyed. Sometimes such a condition is produced by an injury to the left side of the head, and then it may happen that a surgical operation leads at once to the restoration of the function.

Thus a man who was aphasic was the subject of a clinical lecture by the writer. From his friends, his own gestures and the few words he could speak, it was ascertained that several months previously he had been working in a stone quarry and was struck by some piece of the machinery on the left side of the head, immediately over that part of the brain which is considered to be the seat of the function of speech. Since that time he had been unable to speak more than a few words, though he could

pronounce a word that was spoken to him, forgetting it again, however, almost as soon as it was uttered. Thus when asked where he was born he became much excited, gesticulated violently and apparently made every effort to answer. The perspiration stood out in large drops on his forehead, but no sound came from his lips. Then the following conversation took place : "Were you born in Prussia ?" "No." "In Bavaria ?" "No." "In Austria ?" "No." "In Switzerland ?" "Yes, yes, yes—Switzerland, Switzerland," at the same time laughing and moving his hands actively in all directions. He could pronounce words well, but could not write.

The man was a patient in Bellevue Hospital and the writer advised that he be trephined with a view of elevating any depressed piece of bone that might be pressing upon the brain and preventing the exercise of its normal function. The operation was performed a few days afterwards, the patient being placed under the influence of ether. The internal table of the skull was found to be fractured and a splinter of bone was pressing upon a portion of the speech tract. This was removed and as soon as the patient emerged from the anæsthetic condition he spoke perfectly well.

Not long ago a little girl some three or four years of age was under the writer's care for epilepsy and a loss of the power of speech. She had spoken as well as most children up to the age of two years, when she had fallen from her nurse's arms, striking the left side of her head with a good deal of force against the floor. Immediately afterwards convulsions ensued, and were of frequent occurrence up to the time of her coming under observation. With the supervention of the spasms speech became more imperfect, and in a month or two was entirely lost. In other respects the child was sufficiently intelligent, and there was no paralysis anywhere. The case was considered to be one favorable for an operation, and it was accordingly performed by the writer. No fracture of the skull was found, but the skull was strongly adherent to the membranes of the brain at that part, and it required some force to remove the button of bone separated by the trephine. A probe was passed between the brain and the skull and the adhesions broken up. The convulsions gradually ceased, and in a few weeks the child began to utter some words. A year afterwards the mother wrote that there were no longer any spasms and

that the child talked so much that her uncle jokingly remarked that it might be well to send her back and have the bone replaced, for that it was better to have a girl that didn't talk at all than to have one that talked all the time.

Much more severe operations than these are now successfully performed upon the brain. Tumors that would otherwise surely cause the death of the patient are now removed and life and reason preserved. Our knowledge of the anatomy and physiology of the brain enables us to locate these and other diseased conditions with precision, and though it is true that many of the subjects of these operations die, yet it must be borne in mind that death would be the inevitable result in all of them if surgical interference were neglected. If, therefore, we succeed in saving a small proportion of such cases, humanity is the gainer.

There is a form of cranial injury in which surgical aid is esspecially beneficial and in which by prompt action life may frequently be saved. A man falls down an area, for instance, striking his head on the hard surface below. He is stunned for a few minutes and then partially recovers consciousness, which, however, is gradually lost and profound stupor sets in. In such an instance there is probably the rupture of a blood vessel in the membranes of the brain between this organ and the skull and blood is effused, which, by its pressure on the brain, produces stupor and eventually death. Such cases were until within the last few years invariably fatal, and even now, such is the usual result, for comparatively few surgeons know what great advances have recently been made in the science and art of brain surgery. Only a few weeks ago a case of the kind occurred in Washington City in which a man was passively allowed to die when in all probability his life could have been saved by an operation. And this operation is a very simple one. We ascertain from an inspection of the seat of injury on what part of the skull the blow has been received, and we are further strengthened in our search for evidence by the symptoms exhibited by the patient. We trephine the skull at the injured point and let out the blood that has been extravasated. As soon as the pressure is relieved consciousness is regained and the patient lives.

Quite recently operations have been performed upon the skull in cases of idiocy innate or acquired, with the view of removing a supposed disproportion between the size of the brain and the skull,

and thus allowing the organ space in which to grow. A French surgeon proposed the removal of strips of the cranium in cases of idiocy in which the skull was unduly small, and in which as he supposed there was no room tor the brain to expand. Several of his cases and those performed according to his method by other surgeons have been in a measure successful, so that there is decided encouragement to persevere with the operation in instances in which it appears to be suitable. Several years before the publication of his results the writer had performed similar operations for the cure of epilepsy, and in a few cases with complete success.

About a year ago a very interesting case came under his care, being that of a young man who, little by little, passed from a condition of good mental development to one of well-marked imbecility. On each side of the forehead two buttons of bone, the distance of two inches from each other, were removed by the trephine and the intervening bone was then cut away by an instrument especially adapted for the purpose. There was thus on each side of his skull an opening over three inches long and a little more than half an inch wide. He at once began to improve in his mind and in a few days after the performance of the operation he became able to carry on a conversation and even to write letters. He returned home some six weeks after the operation and in a letter received from his father last summer it is stated that his mind has continued to develop and that he is re-acquiring the knowledge of the French language, which he had possessed previous to his illness.

Cases such as these give us reason for believing that with an increased knowledge of the functions of the brain—and there is much yet for us to learn in this regard—and with improved methods of procedure the field of surgical operations on this pre-ëminent organ of the body will be still further enlarged, and the cases that even now seem to be beyond the reach of our art will, as has been the case with so many other apparently hopeless diseases, be added to the triumphs which scientific medicine and surgery are continually achieving.

Antiseptic measures and strict attention to cleanliness and nursing have wonderfully aided in securing the many brilliant results in brain surgery which the trephine and the knife have yielded us. Now, the event most to be feared is not so much the immediate operation as it is the subsequent inflammation and

suppuration resulting from the necessary manipulation and the exposure to the atmosphere. This danger is at the present time reduced to a minimum. The skull is opened, the membranes are divided, the brain itself is explored with probes and knives, an abscess is evacuated, a clot of blood removed, a tumor excised, and the subjects of all these bold and terrible procedures suffer no pain and recover without the formation of a single drop of pus.

WILLIAM A. HAMMOND, M.D.

SHIPBUILDING HERE AND ABROAD.

BY NAVAL-CONSTRUCTOR PHILIP HICHBORN, U. S. N.

THE federal and State laws of the United States have hitherto been singularly adverse to shipping interests, and while every other industry has received encouragement and support through a protective tariff that of shipbuilding has been left to take care of itself. A free-trade advocate, discussing the merits of the Cockran Bill "to encourage American shipping," declares that "there is very little sentiment in the steamship business," which might be further extended to include all sorts of business. Fortunately for American industries sentiment, which in this application stands for national pride, has made them self-supporting and has conferred benefits on all classes alike. Without this sentiment we should still be dependent upon the factories of the old world; and, as the genuine free-trader clamors for, be content to raise breadstuffs to barter for articles manufactured abroad.

American bottoms declined from 66.04 in 1860 to 20.61 per cent. in 1892; and exports in American bottoms were lowered from 66.5 to 12.3 per cent. Because of this lack of sentiment, the only four steamers flying the American flag in the Atlantic fleet were obliged to succumb, in 1884, to the hundreds of competing foreigners; and our Government paid in 1889 only about $110,000 for the transportation of mails in American vessels, while foreign steamship lines received over $510,000.

The bills recently passed by Congress allowing subsidies to American steamers that shall come up to certain requirements is a move in the right direction. It is admitted that the first cost of a ship here is greater than in Scotland and that the expense of running sailing and steam vessels is greater under the American flag than under any other flag; but in the first cost of the vessel the difference is actually not so great as to make ship-owning un-

profitable, as our vessels compare favorably in every respect with similar ones built abroad for like purposes, and will last as long. Opponents at home argue that the first cost and running expenses of American vessels prevent their profitable employment, and our adversaries abroad, such as shipbuilders and underwriters, contend that American ships are lowest in the scale of duration and they therefore discriminate against American bottoms. It is evident that these charges of inferiority are baseless, for it is universally admitted that our iron and steel material is far superior to that used in Europe, and that the design and workmanship should be inferior to foreign work none but supporters of Lloyd's methods would have the hardihood to pretend.

It is only about seven years ago that the English press bubbled over with anticipated joy over the undoubted failures that would follow our attempt to build a new navy. On July 10, 1885, one paper (*The Engineer*) commented upon the proposition of Secretary Whitney to build a number of ships, and sneeringly concluded: "The question is, who is to build them?" Again on January 29, 1886, this same paper referring to the "Chicago," said: "If the boat is a success then it is clear that British engineers do not know their business." These adverse comments might be multiplied to an interminable extent, but the hopes of our enemies abroad were not realized; a dozen firms have built a fleet of men-of-war unsurpassed by any, and the "Chicago" has proved a success.

The following tables show the relative cost of ships in foreign navies and in the American navy, but it should be borne in mind that there are no two ships identical in every respect produced in the different navies, and that displacement and cost afford no fair basis of comparison. The speed, armament and protection vary with the ships.

The accompanying tables exhibit some remarkable facts. A fair idea of comparative cost can be obtained only from exactly similar ships built under like conditions and at the same time in the respective countries. It is quite evident that the "Charleston" and "Yorktown" did not realize any profit to the builders, and later-built ships may be taken as a nearer correct basis for comparisons. With the disadvantage of paying nearly twice as much for labor and one-third more for material, our shipbuilders have done remarkably well in producing ships

COMPARATIVE COST OF UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN NAVAL VESSELS. HULL AND MACHINERY.

United States Navy.

Name.	Class.	Built.	Tons.	Horse Power.	Speed.	Contract Cost.	Cost per Ton.
Chicago	Cr.	1883	4,500	5,084	15.33	$889,000	$197
Boston	Cr.	1883	3,189	4,030	15.60	619,000	194
Dolphin	D. V.	1883	1,485	2,240	15.5	315,000	212
Newark	Cr.	1887	4,083	8,869	19.	1,248,000	305
Charleston	Cr.	1887	4,040	6,666	18.2	1,017,000	251
Baltimore	Cr.	1887	4,600	10,064	19.58	1,325,000	284
Philadelphia	Cr.	1888	4,324	8,815	19 68	1,325,000	306
Yorktown	G. B.	1887	1,700	3,660	16.65	455,000	262
Petrel	G. B.	1887	890	1,513	11.55	247,000	277
Montgomery	Cr.	1890	2,000	5,400	17.	612,500	306
Machias	G. B.	1890	1,050	1,600	14.	318,000	303
Cincinnati*	Cr.	1890	3,183	10,000	19.	†1,100,000	345
Olympia	Cr.	1890	5,500	13,500	20.	‡1,796,000	326
Columbia	Cr.	1890	7,350	21,000	21.	‡2,725,000	370

* Building in navy-yard.
† Complete except armament.
‡ Complete except armament and equipment.

Foreign Navies.

Nationality.	Name.	Class.	Built.	Tons.	Horse Power.	Speed.	Contract Cost.	Cost per Ton.
British.	Leander	Cr.	1880	4,300	5,500	17.	$793,335	$184
British.	Terpsichore	Cr.	1888	3,400	9,000	20.	781,610	229
British.	Surprise	D. V.	1883	1,650	3,030	17.	346,820	210
French.	Alger*	Cr.	1887	4,160	8,000	19.2	1,272,515	278
French.	Davoust*	Cr.	1887	3,027	9,000	20.	965,200	318
Spanish	Reine Regenta.	Cr.	1888	4,800	11,000	20.7	1,100,000	228
Germ	Princess Wilhelm.	Cr.	1885	4,300	8,000	18.	1,125,000	261
British.	Archer	T. Cr.	1885	1,770	3,500	17.	336,905	190
British.	Bellona	Cr.	1888	1,830	6,000	19.5	390,025	213
French.	Lalande	Cr.	1886	1,877	6,000	20.5	591,875	310
Germ	Wacht	D. V.	1887	1,240	4,000	20.	357,000	286
British.	Mercury*	Cr.	1876	3,730	7,290	18.	1,128,255	302
French.	Cecille	Cr.	1885	5,766	9,600	19.	1,498,010	259
French.	Le Tage	Cr.	1885	7,015	10,330	19	1,767,005	250
British.	Endymion	Cr.	1888	7,350	12,000	19.75	1,508,540	205
British.	Blenheim	Cr.	1888	9,000	17,000	21.	1,829,910	209
British.	Blake*	Cr.	1888	9,000	17,000	21.	1,672,930	185
British.	Edgar*	Cr.	1888	7,350	12,000	19.75	1,616,120	220

* Built in dock yards and not including establishment charges in British Dock Yard.

at an advanced cost of only about 33 per cent. over British ships. That German and French ships make such an extraordinary showing in cost, notwithstanding the beggarly wages paid in those countries, strongly intimates that cheap labor is not so profitable in the end.

M. Dislere, writing in 1878 about British and French shipbuilding, said that the average wages paid in British dockyards

were 6 fr. 7 c. ($1.34) per day, against 2 fr. 58 c. (51.6 cents) in French dockyards, yet the cost of work was about the same in the two countries. Captain Gambier, R. N., in *The Engineer* of March, 1887, describing shipbuilding and engine work in Italy, shows that it costs nine cents per pound for labor, and yet wages are much lower in Italy than in England. In December, 1890, the London *Times* claimed the relative cost per ton weight of hull to be: In England, £30 5s.; in France, £46 9s.; and in Russia, £87 5s. It gave also the cost of engines per horse power at £30 4s. in England, and in the United States at £56.

Coming down to a later date, the average wages in French dockyards in 1892 were 69 cents per day, and in British dockyards $1.21. For the corresponding time, the average wages paid in the navy yards of the United States may be assumed to be $2.40, and the wages thus stand in the following order:

United States,	$2.40 = 2 × England and 3½ × France.
England,	1.21 = ½ of U. S. and 1¾ × France.
France,	.69 = 28¾ per cent. of U. S. and 57 per cent. of England.

Now, as to material, the cost of steel for the ships built for the United States Navy during 1887 and 1888 was not less than 4 cents per pound against 2½ cents paid in England during the same period. Assuming that this same difference in cost extended to all other kinds of material used in ship and engine construction, the account stands 60 per cent. to the disadvantage of this country. Taking a ship like the "Charleston," as an example for comparison, with a similar British ship, the proportionate expenditures are 69 per cent. for labor and 31 per cent. for material of the sum total, which would make the cost of the American-built ship 72.6 per cent. greater than the British-built. The table of comparative cost of ships does not, however, give any such results, and, besides, it is conceded that every vessel built for our navy from a foreign ship is a great improvement on its prototype; that the material used is superior to that used in England; and that our ships are fitted up in a manner such as to make them luxurious in comparison with foreign ships. "The little extravagancies on our part," as Mr. Charles Cramp expressed it in a recent article in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW —explaining the apparent greater cost of United States naval vessels—are quite properly and justly incurred, for life on board a ship is not comfortable at best, and there is no good reason why

the ship's officers and crew should be made still more uncomfortable through stinginess on the part of the Government.

The foregoing tables prove conclusively that this country, unskilled as it was claimed to be in building ships of war, has been able not only to copy successfully but also to improve greatly upon the war vessels built abroad. Six years ago neither shafts, gun forgings nor armor cohld be produced in this country, and we were dependent upon England and Germany. At the present time we have reached not only the height of foreign achievements in ships, gun and armor, but have improved upon them; and if navy-building be permitted to go on, establishments will multiply and improve so as to make it not only possible but quite probable that the United States will become the factory of war material for such countries as now go to England, France and Germany.

As naval shipbuilding is the highest grade of ship construction, it follows that when occasion demands we shall be able to turn out duplicates of and improvements upon such ships as the "City of New York,"* "Fürst Bismarck," "Touraine" and "Teutonic." The building of large ocean steamers presents less difficulties than that of ships-of-war of moderate size. In the large ocean steamer everything is sacrificed for speed, and length, width and depth are allotted without stint. In a ship of 500 to 600 or more feet it is upon the marine engineer mainly that everything depends, and it would be passing strange if our talent in that line could not reproduce and improve upon the splendid engines in our new navy where the designer was cramped for room.

Until the American flag was hoisted on the "City of New York," * on February 22, there were no fast transatlantic steamers flying the stars and stripes. We have had, however, home-built steamships plying on the Pacific, south Atlantic and to the West Indies, not to omit the coasting and lake steamers, that are as fast, as commodious, and as safe as similar vessels (if such exist) abroad. The old "City of Peking," built in 1874, is a better and more profitable steamer than the "China," built in Glasgow in 1889, and placed on the same route as the "City of Peking." The following comparative data may be of interest

*Now the "New York."

Data.	City of Peking.	China.
Built	1874	1889
Gross tons	5,079	5,480
Cargo capacity	4,000	3,600
Length over all, feet	423	466
Maximum speed	15	17
Coal, tons per day, at 11 knots	47	61
" " " " 12 "	56	68
" " " " 13 "	68	81
" " " " 14 "		100
" " " " 15 "		125

It will be noted that the coal consumption, so important a factor in successful steamship running, is decidedly in favor of the "City of Peking."

Taking a few instances of well-known American-built steamers, we find the "Louisiana," of 2,840 tons, consuming only 34 tons, at a speed of 14¾ knots; the "Mariposa," 3,158 tons, burning 50 tons to make 14½ knots, and the "San Pablo," 3,119 tons, requiring only 35 tons at 13 knots, and 40 tons to make 14 knots. Then there is the "Australia," 2,730 tons, a British steamer, chartered for the San Francisco and Melbourne route, originally fitted with compound engines, and with a consumption of 53 tons of coal making only 12 knots. In 1889 her engines and boilers were removed, and new triple expansion engines and boilers carrying 160 pounds were built in San Francisco and put in the ship. With this new machinery she is now making 14 knots on an expenditure of only 37 tons. From these examples it would appear as if American marine engine-builders have a considerable share of the knowledge of which Scotch builders claim a monopoly; while the performance of the old "City of Peking" would indicate that our marine engineers know more of the economics of steamship performance than the Clyde builders.

It is stated that no less than four steamers, duplicates of and possibly improvements upon the "City of Paris," are to be built at Cramp's Yard. The question of ability to build ships in this country is no longer to be mentioned in discussing the subject. It is simply a question of dollars and sentiment, and there seem to be men willing to make a practical demonstration of their patriotism and take the chances of American transatlantic travellers patronizing an American steamship line. To reproduce a new "City of Paris" in a shipyard on this side will require an advanced cost of about 20 per cent. upon

$1,600,000, the reported cost of that steamer, which was built in Scotland.

In the following table the reported cost of some well-known transatlantic steamers is given together with such data as will facilitate computation of cost of similar ships built in this country:

COST OF TRANS-ATLANTIC AND OTHER STEAMERS BUILT IN GREAT BRITAIN AND GERMANY.

Name.	Built.	Iron or steel.	Gross tons.	Horse power.	Speed.	Total cost dollars.	Cost per gross ton.	Builders.
Britannic	1874	I	5,004	5,400	16.08	925,000	$185	Belfast.
Arizona	1879	I	5,164	6,357	17.	825,000	160	Glasgow.
Orient	"	I	5,365	5,595	14.	750,000	140	"
Alaska	1881	I	6,932	10,000	17.87	1,200,000	173	"
Servia	"	S	7,392	10,350	16.75	1,327,000	179	"
Oregon	1883	S	7,375	13,300	18.75	1,680,000	228	"
Aurania	"	S	7,269	8,500	16.85	1,380,000	190	Clydebank
America	1884	S	5,528	7,354	18.71	975,000	176	"
Etruria	"	S	8,120	14,321	18.80	1,695,000	209	"
City of Paris	1888	S	10,499	21,000	20.76	1,600,000	152	"
Augusta Victoria	1889	S	7,641	14,110	18.31	*878,715	*115	Stettin.
Teutonic	"	S	9,686	18,000	20.18	1,954,000	203	Belfast.
Fürst Bismarck	1890	S	8,716	16,000	19.86	*1,002,000	*115	Stettin.
Normannia	"	S	8,250	15,000	19.20	*948,750	*115	Glasgow.

Steamers with a * indicate cost of hull and machinery only. All others are complete with fittings ready for sea.

The cost of mild steel for shipbuilding purposes has been greatly reduced in this country during the past few years. From 6 cents per pound in 1885 it has fallen to 2 cents at the present time, while in Scotland the cost has also decreased in the same period from $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents to $1\frac{1}{3}$ cents. Thus the American shipbuilder has to pay 50 per cent. more for his steel than his competitor on the Clyde. The American workmen receive in Cramp's Yard about 80 per cent. higher wages than were paid to the workmen that built the "City of Paris."

It may therefore be accepted as a fact that in high-class work the shipbuilder in this country requires 20 per cent. more pay, but when it comes to what may be termed second and third class steamers, the Americans are "not in it" at all, and for very good reasons. Competition has greatly reduced the price of steamers in Scotland and the requirements of trade have demanded, or rather made it possible to introduce, a class of steam vessels known as "tramps."

In 1881 the price of transatlantic steamers was quoted at £22

per gross ton for one of 2,000 gross tons, with cabin accommodations and 13 knots speed. In 1891 the price had fallen to about £15 per gross ton. In 1884 the following prices were quoted:

1st class transatlantic steamers	£28 5s.	Over 4,000 gross tons.
2d " " "	£22 17s.	
Cargo	£20 10s.	

In 1891 the price of first-class transatlantic steamers was £21 to £23. At the present time a well-built British steamer of 1,620 gross tons for cargo-carrying will cost £14 10s., and "tramp" steamers, such as are now competing with American-built steamers on the Brazilian steamship line, can be had for £10 per gross ton. The American steamer "Alliance," of 2,500 gross tons, which cost $382,378, has to compete with British "tramps" that cost only $125,000, and it is no wonder that such competition is ruinous to the American steamship-owner. In this instance, however, it is admitted by the president of the company that a mistake has been made in putting on new, large, expensive, and handsome passenger and mail steamships. There are no builders of "tramps" in this country, nor is there any demand for such ships; the nearest approach to them being the Lake steamers, of which several have of late made sad and disastrous records.

While it must be admitted that the extra cost of 20 to 40 per cent. on a steamer, according to her quality, is a serious drawback to shipbuilding, the disadvantage does not terminate with the completion of the ship. The ship-owner in America starts in with 20 to 40 per cent. extra cost and the Federal and State laws immediately cripple his opportunity for successful competition with the cheap ship-owner. Thus an American ship is taxed in its home port the same as any other property, while in England, for example, only the net profits on the vessel are taxed. Various other vexatious and expensive laws curtail the profits of American ship-owners, but it is in the running expenses that he is at the greatest disadvantage, and for this there is no remedy or salvation except through subsidy or protection.

It costs practically as much to build in France and Italy as it does in England, and the margin is not very great between the United States and Great Britain. The enormous difference existing between the wages of the several countries would naturally

lead a person to different conclusions, but the proofs to the contrary are indisputable and not to be controverted. England is to Europe what the United States is to the whole world. To England every poor devil of a workman, underfed and underpaid at home, flocks and shares the work of those already on the ground. His condition is materially improved, but when, in the course of time, he has saved a few pounds wherewith to travel still farther west, he arrives in these United States and here he sees and learns what he never dreamed of—how immeasurably superior his condition may become to what it was. It is because the American workman must live differently to the European workman that he requires and receives better pay, but the return is made in intelligent and conscientious work, and the proof of it is shown in the cost of our navy ships.

Thus, while an American-built ship does cost more than a similar foreign vessel, it is equally true, too, that the sailing of ships under the American flag entails increased expenditures. Take, for example, the actual running expenses of the following representative sailing vessels of 850 tons register :

	American.	British.	French.	German.
Wages	$574.00	$350.25	$315.00	$325.75
Victualing	300.00	250.00	225.00	180.00
Total cost one month	$874.00	$600.25	$540.00	$505.75

To compete successfully against such odds is out of the question. American ship-builders are not permitted, nor would they be allowed, to put afloat such craft as are doing business under foreign flags, and our ship-owner cannot run an expensive ship with a well-paid and well-fed crew, against a cheap foreign ship with a cheap and badly-fed complement. In support of this latter remark reference is made to the testimony before the Labor Commission in London, on January 27, 1892, when Samuel Plimsoll stated that a report to the Board of Trade showed that the food of sailors was worse than workhouse or prison fare ; that condemned naval stores were purchased for ships' use, the price running from 2 cents to 3½ cents per pound for meat, and that "such food was killing the men by the scores and hundreds." Mr. Plimsoll's charges were directed against ocean-going craft such as we know here as "tramps."

President Ivins, of the United States and Brazilian Steamship Company, testified April 28, 1892, before the Senate Committee

on Commerce, that the comparative running expenditures on two steamers, the "Seguranca," an American-built steamer, and the "Glengoyl," a British tramp, were per month :

Seguranca, wages $2,392; provisioning, $1,036.50			$3,428.50
Glengoyl, " 950; " 306.00			1,256.00
Difference in favor of the tramp			$2,172.50

Both ships carry the same amount of cargo.

Mr. Ivins further said : "Now the Government can do either of two things for us. It can say, from humanitarian reasons and reasons of large national policy : 'We want to protect all of our industries alike. We will protect you.' We are the only thing that I can see that is pretty nearly unprotected. Or else it can say: 'Buy your ships where you want and we will give them an American register.'"

It is clear that even if a ship-owner could purchase a steamer abroad at a cost much less than it would cost here, the running expenses would ultimately embarrass him. Therefore, in order to make shipping profitable, the national and State governments should encourage rather than discourage ship-owning. It would not have paid to start many branches of industry in this country had not the Government aided them by protection, and that is just what our shipping needs—liberal subsidies to make the American dollar go as far on the ocean highway as the English crown and the Prussian thaler.

PHILIP HICHBORN.

GOOD AND BAD MOTHERS.

BY MRS. AMELIA E. BARR.

THE difference between good and bad mothers is so vast and so far-reaching that it is no exaggeration to say that the good mothers of this generation are building the homes of the next generation, and that the bad mothers are building the prisons. For out of families nations are made; and if the father be the head and the hands of a family, the mother is the heart. No office in the world is so honorable as hers, no priesthood so holy, no influence so sweet and strong and lasting.

For this tremendous responsibility mother-love has always been sufficient. The most ignorant women have trusted to it; and the most learned have found it potential when all their theories failed. And neither sage men nor wise women will ever devise anything to take the place of mother-love in the rearing of children. If there be other good things present, it glorifies them; if there be no other good thing—it is sufficient. For mother-love is the spirit of self-sacrifice even unto death, and self-sacrifice is the meat and drink of all true and pure affection.

Still this momentous condition supposes some central influence, some obligation, on the child's part which will reciprocate it; and this central influence is found to be in *obedience*. There was once a child in Jewry who was called "wonderful," and yet the most significant fact recorded of his boyhood is, that he "was subject unto his parents." Indeed nothing else is told of the child, and we are left to conclude that in the pregnant fact of his boyish obedience lay the secret of his future perfect manhood. Unselfish love in the mother! cheerful obedience in the children! in whatever home these forces are constantly operative, that home can not be a failure. And mother-love is not of the

right kind, nor of the highest trend, unless it compels this obedience.

The assertion that affectionate firmness and even wholesome chastisement is unnecessary with our advanced civilization is a specious and dangerous one. The children of to-day have as many rudimentary vices as they had in the days of the patriarchs; as a general thing they are self-willed and inclined to evil from their cradles; greedy without a blush, and ready to lie as soon as they discover the use of language. A good mother does not shut her eyes to these facts; she accepts her child as imperfect, and trains it with never-ceasing love and care for its highest duties. She does not call impudence "smartness," nor insubordination "high spirit," nor selfishness "knowing how to take care of itself," nor lying and dishonesty "sharpness." She knows if the child is to be father to the man, what kind of a man such a child will make.

How to manage young children; how to strengthen them physically; how best to awaken their intellects, engage their affections and win their confidence; how to make home the sweetest spot on earth, a place of love, order and repose, a temple of purity where innocence is respected, and where no one is permitted to talk of indecent subjects or to read indecent books; these are the duties of a good mother: and her position, if so filled, is one of dignity and grave importance. For it is on the hearthstone she gives the fine healthy initial touch to her sons and daughters that is not effaced through life, and that makes them blessed in their generation.

There is another duty, a very sacred one, which some mothers, however good in all other respects, either thoughtlessly or with mistaken ideas, delegate to others—the religious training of their children. No Sunday-School and no Church can do it for them. The child that learns "Our Father" at its mother's knee; that hears from mother's lips the heroic and tender stories of the Bible, has a well spring of religious faith in his soul that no after life, however hard and fast and destructive, can dry up. It is inconceivable then how a mother can permit any other woman to deprive her of an influence over her children nothing can destroy; of a memory in their lives so sweet, that when every other memory is withered and approaching decay, it will still be fresh and green; yes, even to the grave's mouth. Family!

Country! Humanity! these three, but the greatest of the three is Family; and the heart of the family is the good mother. Happy the children who have one! With them

> "faith in womankind
> Beats with their blood, and trust in all things high
> Comes easy to them."

But if the grand essential to a good mother be self-denying, self-effacing love, this is a bad era for its development. Selfishness and self-seeking is the spirit of the time, and its chilling poison has infected womanhood, and touched even the sacred principle of maternity. In some women it assumes the form of a duty. They feel their own mental culture to be of supreme importance, they wish to attend lectures and take lessons, and give themselves to some special study. Or the enslaved condition of their own sex troubles them; they bear on their minds the oppressed shop girls of America, or the secluded Odalisques in some Eastern seraglio, or they have ecclesiastic proclivities and take the chair at church meetings, or political ones and deliver lectures before their special club on women's disabilities. In these and many other ways they put the natural mission of womanhood aside as an animal instinct, not conducive to their mental development.

Now, no one will object to women's devoting themselves to works of religion and charity; but this devotion should come before marriage. If they have assumed the position of wifehood, it is a monstrous thing to hold themselves degraded by its consequences; or to consider the care of children a waste of their own life. The world can do without learned women, but it cannot do without good wives and mothers; and when married women prefer to be social ornaments and intellectual amateurs, they may be called philanthropists and scholars, but they are nevertheless moral failures, and bad mothers.

Society has put maternity out of fashion also, and considering the average society woman, it is perhaps just as well. No children are more forlorn and more to be pitied than the waifs of the woman whose life is given up to what she calls "pleasure." Humbler-born babies are nursed at their mother's breast and cradled in her loving arms. She teaches them to walk and to read. In all their pain she soothes them; in all their joys she has a part; in all their wrongs "mother" is an ever-present help and com-

forter. The child of the fashionable woman is too often committed at once to the care of some stranger, who for a few dollars a month is expected to perform the mother's duty for her. If it does not suck the vitiated, probably diseased, milk of some peasant, it has the bottle and india-rubber mouth piece, when the woman in charge chooses to give it. But she is often in a temper, or sleepy, or the milk is not prepared, or she is in the midst of a comfortable gossip, or she is dressing or feeding herself, and it is not to be expected she will put any sixteen-dollar-a-month baby before her own comfort or pleasure.

The child cannot complain of hunger, it can only cry, and very likely may be struck for crying. What these neglected little ones suffer from thirst is a matter painful to inquire into. The nurse accustomed to drink her tea and her beer at all hours does not herself patronize cold water, and she never imagines the child needs it. Many a baby after being tortured for hours with a feverish consuming thirst passes into the doctor's hands before the trouble is recognized. But if the child's own mother had been nursing it she would not have been long in finding out the cause of its impatient, urgent fretfulness.

Let any tender-hearted woman go into the parks and watch one of these unhappy children in the care of its nurse. The hot sun beats down on the small upturned face, and the ignorant creature in charge goes on with her flirtation, or her gossip, or her novel. The child may be at shrieking point from lying long in one position, but there is no one to comprehend its necessity. During those awful hours in which its teeth force their way through hot and swollen gums—hours which would bring from adults unwriteable exclamations—the forsaken little sufferer is at the mercy of some sleepy, self-indulgent woman, who has no love for it. Why, indeed, should she? If it were a matter of catechism, how many educated women would be capable of nursing good-naturedly for weeks a fretful, sick child not their own?

As for these neglected babies of pleasure-seeking women, they suffer terribly, but then their mothers are having what they consider a perfectly lovely time, posing at the opera or gyrating in some ballroom, exquisitely dressed, and laughing as lightly as if there were no painful echoes from their neglected nurseries. For no nurse is apt to complain of her baby, she knows her business

and her interest too well for that; she prefers to speak comfortable words, and vows the "little darling grows better and better every hour, God bless it!" and, so assured, the mother goes airily away, telling herself that her nurse is a perfect treasure. Whatever other nurses may do, she knows that her nurse is reliable. The fact is, that even where there are children in a nursery able to complain of the wrongs and cruelties they have to endure they very seldom dare to do so. Mamma is a dear, beautiful lady, very far off; nurse is an ever-present power, capable of making them suffer still more. And mamma does not like to hear tales, she always appears annoyed at anything against nurse. They look into their mother's face with eyes full of their sad story, if she only had the heart to understand; but they dare not speak, and very soon they are remanded back to their cruel keeper with a kiss, and an injunction to "be good, and do as nurse tells them."

Consider the women to whom this class of mothers delegate their high office—an office for which hardly any love or wisdom is sufficient. It would scarcely be possible in the whole world to find any persons more unfit for it. Taking this class as a whole, these very mothers are never tired of expatiating upon its gross immorality, deceitfulness, greed and dishonesty; yet they do not hesitate to leave the very lives of their children in the charge of these women, whose first lessons to them are lying and deceit. It is a hideous system, and how hideous must that life called "pleasure" be, that can thus put aside love, reason, conscience, and break to pieces a natural law so strong that in its purity it frequently proves more powerful than the law of self-preservation. Writing on this subject, Frederick James Grant, F. R. C. S., in his bold and original book, *From Our Dead Selves*, tells of a fashionable mother who put her first child out to nurse, and who, when her second died at birth and was brought to her bedside in its coffin, was entirely interested—not in the child—but in the pretty lining and covering of the coffin. For it is one of the startling facts of this condition of motherhood that the poor infant left to some dreadful shrew, body and soul, has the very best care taken of its frills and coats and of the wraps in its baby carriage. For these things will be seen by other people's servants and commented on, and are therefore worthy of attention.

It is a strange state of society which tolerates this awful transfer of duty, and society will have the bill to pay as well as the

cruel mother. These neglected children, whatever their birth, come really from the dangerous classes, and have a likelihood to drift there. For the first moral training of a child is the most important of all, and in these cases it is given by women gross both through ignorance and vice; whose relatives are very likely at the same time living in suspicious localities, or in prison wards. And, naturally enough, their first lessons to the children under them are to lie, to deceive, to commit small pilferings and not be found out. They are ordered not to carry tales out of the nursery, or let mamma know what nurse does not want known. Bad language, bad habits, hatred, petty conciliations, meanness of every kind, are in the curriculum of any nursery left in the care of the women usually found in them.

No one need imagine that the evil thus wrought can be eradicted in future years by a higher class of teachers. The vicious seed is sown; it is next to impossible to go through the field of a child's mind and gather it up again. It has taken root, and unless it can be crowded out by a nobler growth, the harvest is certain. The mother then who prefers pleasure and society to her children, whom she hands over to wicked and cruel nurses, is herself wicked and cruel. She may stand before the world as the personification of refinement and delicacy and elegance, but she is really no better than her substitute; and she has no right to expect that her children will be better. In some favorable cases there may come a redeeming power in future years, but in the main they will drift downward to their first moral impressions; and when they have become bad and unhappy men and women, they will not scruple to say "from our mother cometh our misery." These are hard truths, yet one-half has not been told. For if it were not for the abounding number of good mothers both rich and poor, this class of women would undermine all virtue, and everything lovely and of good report.

There was once an idea that mothers were the antiseptic quality in society, that they preserved its moral tone, by insisting that the language used and the subjects discussed before them should be such as were suitable for virtuous women. But there is one kind of bad mother to whom questionable subjects seem highly suitable. She discusses them without reserve in the presence of her daughters, and she makes her drawing room the forum for women with queer domestic views, for "Physical Cul-

ture" women, and such-like characters. The things our grandmothers went down to their graves without knowing she talks about in unmistakable terms before unmarried girls. A certain mother who boldly defended her opinion that "girls should not be kept ignorant as a means for keeping them innocent," permitted her own daughter to be present during all the unsavory scandal of Vanity Fair. The child learned to watch with interest the doings of women of many seasons, and to listen with composure to very questionable stories. Before she was twelve years old she had become suspicious of the conduct of every woman, and when her teacher one day asked her "Who was Moses?" she answered promptly "The son of Pharoah's daughter." "Not the son," corrected the teacher, "the adopted son. Pharoah's daughter found him in the river Nile." "*So* she said," replied this premature woman; suspicions of women's actions and a ready assumption of the very worst motives for them, being the lessons she had deduced from knowledge imparted before mind and experience were capable of receiving it.

It is often said that "ignorance is not innocence." True, but neither is knowledge innocence; it is most frequently the first step of guiltiness. What good can come of little children knowing the things which belong to maturity? Is any girl sweeter or even safer for knowing about the undercurrent of filth below the glittering crust of gilded society. The Chinese quarter is a fact, yet is there a mother who would like her daughter to visit it? But if it is not fit to visit, it is not fit to talk about. No one is ever the better for knowing of evil, unless they can do something to remedy it.

A good mother will shield her children from the consequences of their own ignorance, physical and moral, and she will just as carefully shield them from knowledge which is hurtful because premature; just as fruit green and unripe is hurtful. And no guardianship is too close for this end. Mothers will generally admit this fact as regards the children of other people, but as to their own brood they cradle themselves in a generous belief of its incorruptibility. Their girls would never do as other girls do; and their girls are consequently permitted a license which they would think dangerous for any but their own daughters. Then some day there is a paragraph in one of the papers and the men blame the man, and the women blame the girl, and all the time the

mother is probably the guiltiest of the parties. She has stimulated her daughter's imagination in childhood, she has left her to the choice of her companions in youth, she has trusted her sacred duty to circumstances, she has indulged a vague hope concerning the honor and virtue of humanity, and thus satisfied her indolent neglect. But what right had she to expect that men would revere the treasure she herself left unguarded?

For there has been no special race made for this era; what Adam, Jacob, Samson and David were; what Eve, Sarah, Rachel, Jael and Bathsheba were, the men and women of to-day are, in all their essentials. Circumstances only have made them to differ; and nature laughs at circumstances, and goes back at any crisis to her first principles. Indeed, the good mother of to-day, instead of relaxing, must increase her care over her children. For never since the world began has youth been so catered to, never has it been surrounded by so many open temptations, never so much flattered, and yet at the same time never have the reins of discipline been so far relaxed. Now the spirit we evoke we must control, or else we must become its slave. If we are no longer to reverence the grey hairs of age; if young men are to drive the chariot of the sun, and young women are to be allowed to strip the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil, then it is high time some system of education was invented which will put old heads upon young shoulders. Alas, this can never be, for education is a long and composite process, made up of home influences, surrounding circumstances, and early associations. When books and schools and teachers shall have done all they possibly can, high above every Gamaliel will sit the good mother; the first influence, the first teacher, the first friend and the last.

AMELIA E. BARR.

HOW SHALL THE PENSION LIST BE REVISED?

BY REPRESENTATIVE R. P. C. WILSON, OF MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS; GEN. S. S. BURDETT, PAST COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC, AND COL. W. C. CHURCH, EDITOR OF THE "ARMY AND NAVY JOURNAL."

HON. R. P. C. WILSON:

THAT the condition of the nation's finances is such as to imperatively demand a material reduction of expenditures or a largely increased revenue to avoid an actual deficit in the Treasury is conceded on all sides, and the sentiment of the country seems unmistakably to point towards a more economical policy in the appropriation of the public money, rather than to increased taxation to maintain the present high rate of governmental disbursements.

The necessities of the situation seem, therefore, to require a close scrutiny of every item of expense, with a view to reduction wherever the same can be accomplished without injury to the public service or a failure to recognize the just obligations of the Government.

The pension roll, representing, as it does, by far the greatest item in the nation's annual bill of expenses, and bearing a large number of names which have no legal or moral right to be there, is just now drawing an important share of the public attention as a promising field for retrenchment and reform. The question as to how the pension list can be revised so as to remove therefrom the fraudulent and undeserving, and at the same time work no injury to the worthy veteran, is a serious and perplexing one, and many who have given the subject much careful thought find it difficult of solution.

My observation leads me to believe that the operations of the Act of June 27, 1890, have a great deal to do with producing the prevailing sentiment against the vast and ever-growing pension

list, and it is to a change in the present construction of that Act that I look for a probable remedy for some of the evils complained of. The report of the Commissioner of Pensions for the fiscal year 1892 shows that on June 30, 1892, 293,068 invalid pensions had been allowed under the Act above named, and many thousands of names have been added to the roll since that date. The Act provides among other things that "all persons who served ninety days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the War of the Rebellion, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, and who are now or may hereafter be suffering from a mental or physical disability of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, which incapacitates them from the performance of manual labor in such a degree as to *render them unable to earn a support*, shall . . . be placed upon the list of invalid pensioners of the United States, and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding $12 per month, and not less than $6 per month, proportioned to the degree of disability to earn a support." The words "in such a degree as to be unable to earn a support" should, it is contended (and apparently with much reason), have been held to mean that the applicant shall be wholly incapacitated by mental or physical disability from obtaining a livelihood, in order to secure the maximum rating of $12 per month, and that the lesser ratings under the Act ($6, $8 and $10 per month) should of course be allowed for proportionate disabilities.

Under the present construction of this law there is no discrimination, within the limits of the rates named, between the allowances for disabilities shown to have originated in the service and line of duty, and the allowances for those which were incurred long after the close of the war. Thousands of pensioners now on the list receive the highest rating allowed by the Act under discussion without being wholly (or totally) disabled; on the contrary, they are able to and do continue in the regular pursuit of their chosen avocations and earn for themselves and families an adequate and comfortable support.

Should the view above referred to as to the proper construction of the Act prevail, it is believed that the result would be to strike from the list the names of many beneficiaries who did not render the service or suffer the disabilities necessary to give a just title to the bounty of the Government, and the saving to the

public treasury by such a construction would no doubt be very large.

A return to biennial medical examinations suggests itself as another practical way of separating some of the goats from the sheep. Prior to June 21, 1879, those invalid pensioners whose disabilities were not of a permanent character or unchanging in degree were, every two years, subjected by law to a careful medical examination to determine their title to continuance on the roll, but by an Act passed on June 21, 1879, these biennial examinations were abolished, and there is now no adequate way by which a pensioner's partial or complete recovery can become known to the Government unless he invites a medical examination by filing an application for an increase of pension, and this a pensioner who knows his disabilities no longer exist is not likely to do. The remedy for this lies with the Congress, but if anything is done to revive the biennial examinations careful account should be taken of the probable large increase in the appropriations for examining-surgeons' fees caused thereby. It may be stated in this connection that the applicants and pensioners themselves formerly paid the fees of the examining surgeons, but now the Government pays them, and I am not an advocate of a return to the original method.

Regulations should be adopted by the Pension Bureau by which favoritism and personal bias in the reports of examinations by the Government's physicians will be prevented, and to this end the suggestions to the House Committee on Appropriations made at the present session by the Medical Referee of the Pension Bureau that the Bureau be represented in examinations throughout the country by competent physicians detailed from the Washington office may, upon close examination, be found to be worthy of trial.

Many pensions are now drawn and rated on the findings and recommendations of examining-boards made up of the family physicians and personal and political friends of the persons examined. The certificates of medical examination are not held to be confidential by the Pension Bureau, but are easy of access to the pensioners and their representatives, and the examining surgeons know this.

All cases of reported fraud should be promptly investigated by the Department through the medium of the force of special ex-

aminers in the field, but in no instance should a pensioner's name be dropped from the roll on any ground until he has been allowed the widest latitude to show his right to a continuance of his pension.

The proposition has been advanced that a commission be appointed to go over the allowed claims now in the files of the Pension Office, but in the light of the enormous number of such cases (876,068 on June 30, 1892, with many thousands allowed since then), and of the fact that they represent the labors of a great bureau for thirty or more years, I fear that such a commission would have to be unwieldy in its proportions and expensive in operation to accomplish any results, and even then it is doubtful whether more than a superficial skimming over would be the outcome. Aside from the claims allowed under the law of June 27, 1890, which of course would be affected by the change of construction heretofore suggested, it would, to my mind, be utterly impracticable to attempt a wholesale readjudication of these admitted cases.

There can be no doubt that the deserving soldier who went unflinchingly to the front at his country's call, and while enduring the hardships of camp, march, and conflict incurred wounds or other permanent disabilities, regards the pension list as a roll of honor, and earnestly desires, with all other good citizens, the adoption of such measures by Congress, or by those charged with the administration of the laws, as will purge the list of all those who have been placed thereon through fraud or misrepresentation; but the undeserving class, which, unfortunately, constitutes a considerable proportion of the list, will never relinquish the benefits wrongfully acquired without a bitter and determined struggle, and many well-meaning and conscientious men in public life, who acknowledge and earnestly deplore the existence of pension abuses, will hesitate to align themselves on the side of corrective measures for fear of a possible adverse effect upon their political fortunes. I contend, therefore, that the administration of the pension laws should, if possible, be completely divorced from politics, and while I have not yet been able to fully satisfy my mind as to the practicability of the change, it may be found, upon careful consideration and investigation, that the transfer of the bureau to the War Department, proposed in a recently offered (but not adopted)

amendment to the Pension Appropriation Bill, and to the care of a courageous, able, and fair-minded army officer, would be a step in the right direction.

The demand that the pension list be maintained in its ideal status as a roll of honor is not a partisan one, but voices the sentiment of the conservative and enlightened people of the country without regard to party affiliations.

These views as to the best methods of accomplishing a just revision of the pension list are confessedly tentative and of so general a character that they may be of but little value in pointing out the proper road to be followed, but I desire to urge that, whatever may be done, no violent or vindictive hand should be laid on the roll. The matter should be approached in a just, dispassionate, and liberal spirit, and no pains should be spared to preserve inviolate the rights of every worthy veteran. The country would deprecate any vicious attack on the pension roll, and any party that advocates such a course will meet with the just condemnation of the people.

To the men whose sufferings and sacrifices led to the preservation of the Union the country owes a debt of gratitude which can never be fully repaid, and I earnestly urge that no backward step be taken by the Government in the material recognition of that great obligation. From the war of the Revolution down to the present time it has been the policy of our lawmakers to treat our soldiers liberally, and there should be no departure from that policy now.

R. P. C. WILSON.

PAST COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF BURDETT:

THE body of our pension laws and the present methods of their administration are the outgrowth of the sense of justice which plainly demands that permanent impairment of capacity to earn a livelihood resulting from service should be, in some measure, compensated by a money payment from the common treasury; of the sentiment of gratitude towards those who in the behalf of all who remained loyal assumed in the field the burden of the common defence; of the engagements and promises which rival parties and politicians seeking the soldier vote thought it necessary to enter upon to secure party or personal success; and of the efforts of the veteran beneficiaries themselves, made

through individual exertion or the agency of their organized associations.

Whatever of praise or blame may be due to these several agencies considered separately, it is undeniable that the result reached by their joint influence is the cause of much present criticism and of some alarm.

The sums required to satisfy the allowed claims are very great, pending applications are many, and the field from which they may yet be gathered is far from exhausted. How considerable a factor the pension list has come to be is just now more sensibly appreciated than ever before. A new party has come into power, pledged to a revolution in financial and industrial legislation and policies. It can take no step towards the accomplishment of its purposes that will not first and chiefly demand consideration of the sums necessary to be raised for pension payments. The necessities of that service may prevent or delay the fulfilment of beneficial purposes entertained by that party, and they will be sure to be held to answer for the non-fulfilment of promises, not wisely given perhaps, but which the voters nevertheless expect to be redeemed.

The present dissatisfaction is therefore likely to continue and may tend to diminish the honorable regard in which the living and the dead of the great struggle have thus far been held by the masses of their countrymen. The stage of denunciation has been reached. It is chiefly directed against the veteran beneficiaries. That which is most virulent is the utterance of the class who believe that the war for the Union was wrong; that which is greatest in volume falls from those who go no further than to read the totals of the annual appropriations, but fail to recall that the foundations were laid in a struggle which itself was vast in its every agency, and especially in the hosts who marched to battle.

Four years of offensive war, which rallied two and a half millions of men to the colors of but one of the combatants, meant resulting obligations in due proportion. Unfortunately for the veteran, the levy made for his benefit is a present burden, the service by which he earned his dole is but a memory. The events of thirty years ago are in these rushing times coming to be counted as among the antiquities.

The courses of thought which have controlled the veterans of

the late war on the general subject of pensions may best be gathered from an analysis of the proceedings of their organized societies. The greatest of these, and the most truly representative, is the Grand Army of the Republic. It was instituted in 1866, and has held its encampments each succeeding year. It has a present membership of half a million comrades. The first action looking towards influencing legislation was taken at the eighth annual session held in 1874, when a resolution was adopted urging Congressional action "for increased pensions to wounded and disabled soldiers and sailors, and especially to those totally disabled."

Seven years afterwards, at the annual session in 1881, attention was called by resolution to the great delay in the settlement of pension claims, and a committee was appointed to inquire into the subject. That committee, in its report to the next encampment (1882), recited the fact that it was the first accredited representative of the order which had ever "come directly in contact with the law-making power." Its work had been to persuade Congress to increase the clerical force employed in the adjustment of pension claims. From that time forward a pension committee charged with the duty of caring for veteran interests has been regularly appointed by each succeeding encampment.

From the reports of these committees, and the action taken thereon, it may be stated that the later energies of the organization have been mainly exercised in obtaining such an enlargement of the old law as would add to the pension list "all honorably-discharged soldiers and sailors, actually disabled, without requiring proof that the disability arose in the line of duty during service; the widows of all honorably-discharged veterans, and an increase of pensions allowed to minor children."

The passage of the Act of June 27, 1890, commonly called the disability bill, which dealt with these purposes, was largely aided by the pension committee. It may be confidently stated that the Grand Army, in large majority, holds to the justice of this act. It should, however, be noted that a considerable minority within the ranks of the organization refuse their consent to the departure thus taken from the old ground of limiting pensionable disabilities to such as occurred during the service. This minority has vehemently opposed the endorsement of projects

looking to the enactment of a service pension law which would at once add every living veteran to the rolls, an honorable discharge being the sole test of the right to be there.

Some of the grounds of objection have been that, whilst grants of public money for injuries received when prosecuting the nation's business of war were part of the contract of enlistment, payments on other grounds, especially on that of service rendered or disabilities subsequently contracted, are, at best, a gratuity, and very like a charity. The moral right to so dispose of the public funds was questioned. The immense burdens such a policy would impose were perceived, and it was feared that the glorious name of the Volunteers might fade under the imputation of mercenary motives.

The progress of thought and purpose in the Grand Army on pension subjects is interesting.

The early gatherings were composed of men fresh from the field who were yet comparatively young and strong. They were proud of their service. They sought no pecuniary reward. The charitable features of their organization had in view the assistance one comrade could give another. It was eight years before it occurred to them to intervene between the government and their disabled comrades, and then only in aid of the most seriously injured, and in line with the government's original contract. The next step arose out of their just concern for the prompt settlement of pending applications. It was not until the tremendous inroads caused by the strain of war began to manifest themselves by the premature decrepitude of many of their comrades, and the common poor-houses began to know their presence, that the Grand Army took up the question of securing pensions for those disabled and needy veterans who could not trace their ailments back to the very period of service. The purpose was to provide for such as these, and within the limits of that purpose the popular heart has willingly given its consent.

The Act of June 27, 1890, was addressed to this end, but, while it reached and relieved the distressed, it gave like advantage to all qualified applicants without regard to the state of their fortunes who could show themselves "to be suffering from a mental or physical disability of a permanent character . . . which incapacitates them from the performance of manual labor in such a degree as to render them unable to earn a support."

The omission of limitations confining the benefits of the Act to needy applicants only was, in part, the result of the persistent fight which the veterans kept up against any enactment requiring a declaration of poverty as a condition precedent to the grant of a pension, and of the purpose on the part of many to make the law as nearly as might be an approach towards a service pension Act. There is little reason to expect that the situation growing out of this Act will be changed. The people will be slow to insist on the official classification of any of their defenders as paupers. Legislators will take note of this along with the fact that a million old-soldier voters are personally or sentimentally interested in the question, and there is the further fact always to be appealed to that service pensions have been given to the survivors of all our wars. The Act of January 29, 1887, puts upon the rolls at eight dollars a month every surviving officer and enlisted man who served in the war with Mexico and who reaches the age of sixty-two years. The Congress which has just adjourned increased the allowance to twelve dollars per month.

No such discrimination against the men who fought for the preservation of the Union as would result from the repeal or serious modification of the Act of 1890 is possible, while the Mexican and other service pension laws remain in force.

The outcry against the laws is not so great in volume or nearly so vehement in form as is that against the method and result of their administration. It is insisted in many quarters that the rolls are encumbered by names not lawfully entitled to be there. If this is true, it is indeed an outrage which calls for prompt correction. But the very vehemence, excess, and even rudeness, of some of the assailants give warning that their charges ought not to be admitted in any measure until investigation has been had. If matters are as bad as they are asserted to be, there have been worse than mistake and mismanagement; there have been fraud and conspiracy. That all the probabilities are against this is indicated by the dearth of facts which the most hostile have been able to produce. Nevertheless iteration and reiteration have had their effect upon the popular mind. There ought to be searching inquiry through dispassionate (not partisan) agencies. The great body of veteran survivors will welcome this.

In the meantime the situation might as well be faced. Relief to the taxpayer is to come from the scythe of the great reaper.

The beneficiaries are old men now. If not by the actual count of years, they are yet old because of the exposures and decrepitudes which come from their service. All but one of the great leaders in battle are dead; a division of their followers joins them every year. A little patience and the account will be closed.

S. S. BURDETT.

COLONEL CHURCH:

TO DECIDE as to how our pension list should be revised is to determine one of the most difficult problems that can vex legislation. The question is fortunately one free from partisan suggestion. To neither of our great political parties belongs the exclusive credit of generosity towards old soldiers, and upon neither can be charged the sole responsibility for what may be considered unwise liberality. In the closing hours of the last Congress two distinguished Democratic Senators, Mr. Palmer, of Illinois, and Mr. Gorman, of Maryland, united in the declaration "that there seems to be a rivalry in both the great political parties to see how far they can go in the matter of pension legislation." President Cleveland in 1887 signed one of the most liberal pension bills we have ever had, the one granting a pension to all survivors of the Mexican War who had served sixty days in Mexico or en route thereto. It was thirty-nine years after the close of this war when a service pension was granted to these men who secured for us our great southwestern territory, with its enormous store of mineral wealth. Such recognition of service was withheld from the soldiers of the Revolution for fifty-nine years, and from the survivors of 1812 for fifty-seven years. In accordance with these precedents it should be granted to the survivors of our last war somewhere between 1904 and 1922.

We need not be embarrassed in revising our pension list by consideration for any public sentiment in opposition to it among the "duty soldiers" of the War. That old soldier Andrew Jackson declared in a message to Congress, recommending a careful scrutiny into the circumstances and claims of every person drawing a pension, "the honest veteran has nothing to fear from such a scrutiny, while the fraudulent claimant will be detected and the public treasury relieved to an amount far greater than has heretofore been suspected." A veteran of our last war, Major-General O. O. Howard, whose empty sleeve bears testimony

to the reality of his service, quotes with approval the declaration of a Post of the Grand Army of the Republic, in New York City, that "as much real patriotism may be displayed by refraining in times of peace from inflicting unnecessary burdens on the country as by coming to her defense in time of war;" and the further declaration that "any soldier who applies for, or accepts a pension that he does not justly deserve for disability incurred, or receives as a reward for service when he is too old to labor, is guilty of conduct likely to injure the men who were and are willing, without any reward beyond the approval of their own consciences and that honorable fame which is dear to every patriot, to give their blood and their lives for their country." General Howard is undoubtedly correct in his statement that this declaration embodies the common sentiment of living soldiers.

The men who served faithfully from a sentiment of patriotic devotion are unwilling to accept the theory that military service is necessarily demoralizing, or destructive to health, or that—the casualties of war apart—it diminishes a man's ability to compete with his fellows in the struggle for existence.

Who is there among those who served honestly in either of our great armies, North or South, who does not find occasion every day to thank God for the lessons he learned in the army? Call the roll of the survivors of our great war and from each community would respond the men who are there held in the highest respect, not only as good citizens, but as leaders in every undertaking that demands ability of the highest order. They have held and still hold the chief places in our cabinets, in the administration of public affairs, National and State. They sit upon the bench; they manage great industrial enterprises, and the country owes its progress in every department, during the years since the war, to them more than to any single class in the community. Their history illustrates the truth, too little heeded in this country, that one of the best of all trainings for the actual business of life is that obtained in military service. As self-respecting men they are opposed to any legislation which tends to make such service synonymous with pauperism. They ask only that the country shall redeem its promise to provide for those whose services have actually incapacitated them from providing for themselves and their families, that it may be saved from the dishonor of permitting Belisarius to beg his daily bread. They

recognize the generous spirit in which this demand has been responded to, and they are ready to do their part to save the country from the abuse of its bounty.

In considering then the difficult subject of revising our pension list, it is well to have it understood at the outset that much that we suffer from the unwise bestowal of pensions results from that disregard of military ideas and military methods which is chronic in this country. It is a fundamental maxim with the army that a distinction should be made between those who loyally accept the restraints of discipline, and those who for any cause seek to shirk them. The two cardinal sins in the military calendar are malingering and desertion. The man who indulges in them, and thus puts a double burden of responsibility and danger upon his fellows, deprives himself of all claim to consideration.

Congress in its legislation has shown itself unwilling to be guided by the military sentiment that condemns these vices—a sentiment as old as war—as essential to the formation of the character of the true soldier as chastity is to the preservation of true womanhood. Our law makers in their large bounty have ignored the distinction between the duty soldier and the "coffee-cooler,"—the man who lingers in the rear to take his comfort or to escape hardship and risk. It has given undue weight to what is known as a "hospital record," ignoring the very grave question as to whether it is really bound to provide to the end of time for those who burdened the muster rolls with their incapacity, and who are largely responsible for our enormous military expenditures during 1861–5, amounting in the closing year of the war to an annual outlay of one thousand millions of dollars.

Is it not time that we should recognize the fact that our methods of conducting war in disregard of sound military principles are unnecessarily wasteful, and that we are bearing the burdens of our mistakes in a pension list now numbering a total of 876,068, and making rapid progress to a grand aggregate exceeding a million, if it does not reach the twelve hundred thousand figure predicted for it? We still have on the rolls twenty widows and two daughters of the Revolution, the last two survivors of that war having died in 1869, aged, respectively, 105 and 109. There are 165 survivors and 6,657 widows of the war of 1812, and 15,215 survivors and 7,282 widows of the Mexican

War. This leaves 687,862 survivors and 158,893 dependent relatives of the War of the Rebellion, with 426,398 claimants for pensions for this and earlier wars on the list for consideration at the date of the last report, October 1st, 1892, besides 361,663 claimants for increase of pensions.

In the five States of Washington, Oregon, Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas there are now nearly three times as many pensioners as there were soldiers furnished by these States to the War, viz.: 72,960 pensioners to 26,286 soldiers. This is due, of course, to the movement of population to the West, but it is a striking illustration of the extent of our pension roll. There are 38,330 pensioners in the ten States that formed the Southern Confederacy, and 108,436 in the six States that held to a divided allegiance, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, West Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware. In all 146,766 in the old slave States. The banner State on the pension record, Ohio, has 93,386 pensioners, Pennsylvania has 85,370, New York following with 77,920, Indiana with 65,120, Illinois with 63,230, Michigan with 42,258, and Wisconsin with 26,382. The annual payment to pensioners, excluding arrears of pension, amounted last year to $116,877,867.24, and it will probably soon reach a round one hundred and fifty millions. Including arrears, it will probably exceed for a time an average of two hundred millions annually.

It is much easier to show, from the statement of such facts as these, that our pension list should be carefully revised, to the end that it may be made a roll of honor, than it is to suggest feasible methods of revision. One thing seems possible, and that is to so codify our pension laws as to make them intelligible and consistent. Under their present interpretation there are, or were at the date of the last detailed report, no less than one hundred and nineteen grades of pay between the extremes of one dollar a month and seventy-two dollars a month, with three other grades of $100, $166.66⅔, and $466.66⅔ a month, supplied by special Acts to a few exceptional cases. The advance from the lowest to the highest rate is by fractions of a dollar, the average advance being sixty cents.

Another reform that has been suggested is to permit the employment of trained actuaries to determine the exact extent of the burden upon the public treasury. What this is no one now knows, and for a succession of years the Commissioner of Pensions

has been obliged to guess at it, as nearly as he could, and to ask Congress later on to make good the deficiency occasioned by his insufficient estimate.

We know the general fact that the pension outlay thus far in our history has amounted to a round billion and a half, a total which need not alarm us when we remember that this only equals our present amount of expenditure for eighteen months, and that we have, since the close of the War of the Rebellion, paid nearly two billions upon the principal of the public debt, besides twenty-six hundred thousand in interest and premiums.

General Egbert L. Viele has suggested, as the result of his experience in Congress, that the Government should employ competent persons to receive the statements of those who think they are entitled to pensions, and to embody these statements in the proper forms of applications. "A bureau especially charged with this duty, under an officer of the Adjutant-General's department, would certainly act as a barrier against fraudulent claims, would save to the Government many times its cost, while saving to the soldiers all the expense now exacted by the claim agent."

Finally, and most important of all, Congress should provide for printing a list of pensioners, with a statement of the reason for granting a pension in each case. To this should be added a list of those applying for pensions whose cases are pending, including the claimants for increase of pensions. Such a list should be widely distributed, instead of being confined, as was the one printed some years ago, to a few copies passing at once into the hands of persons interested in suppressing the facts. Every army officer should receive copies, and every organization representing old soldiers, and it should be sent to each post-office to be posted there. The attempts made thus far to revise our pension rolls have not paid their cost. The two or three hundred special examiners employed last year succeeded in convicting only one hundred and twenty-two fraudulent pensioners or fourteen-one-hundred-thousandths (.00014) of one per cent. of the whole number of pensioners. To prove that a pension has been wrongly bestowed requires the establishment of a negative proposition, and this in the face of the testimony of honest but possibly mistaken witnesses who are to be accused of no worse sin than the desire to help a neighbor or friend or possibly an old comrade to establish an exact relation between the disability he suffers to-day and the

hardships he endured a generation ago. What man, dealing ever so honestly with himself, can tell to which of his early experiences are due the physical infirmities he suffers from in the decline of life? And as a gift blindeth the judgment, so does the prospect of support or of partial support at the public expense confuse the memory of past experiences.

While endeavoring to set forth fairly the exact condition of the pension problem, I must confess that I have no great sympathy with the present disposition to criticise our appropriations for pensions. We are reaping what we have sown, and in the end we may learn that the money expended in preventing war or in preparing ourselves to conduct it with efficiency is quite as wisely bestowed as that devoted to paying later on for our neglect, and we may find comfort for ourselves in the fact that our expenditures for pensions at the worst showing will not, after the arrears of pensions are settled, exceed the amount contributed annually to the public treasury by the tax upon liquors and cigars. We may be content with the knowledge that it is the vices of our people that are providing for the comfort of our old soldiers, not one of whom should fail to receive what is honestly his due in the way of public support, and let those who object to contributing to this refrain from smoking and drinking. Our liberality toward veterans is in the line of our increase of national expenditure in a ratio beyond that of an increase of population. In 1821 this increase was six millions in excess of this ratio, and in 1870 $164,400,000 in excess. Pensions are not peculiar to the American service; for example, every British soldier receives one after an enlistment of twenty-one years, and a temporary or permanent pension after twelve years if discharged as an invalid or rendered unfit for service.

We give pensions for a service of sixty days and even for one of fourteen days; our pensions are much more liberal and our pensioners much more numerous. That is all the difference. We overlook the distinction between civilians in uniform and soldiers, and put upon the same footing the "bounty-jumper" and the man whose loyal devotion to duty takes no thought of personal advantage.

There is in this country a military class, too little understood and too little esteemed by the general public. It furnishes a type as distinct as the religious, the artistic, the literary, the

scientific, or any of the other types that contribute to a complete nationality. In this class have been found some of the noblest examples of American manhood. Their deeds are indelibly associated with the episodes in our history which have given to our somewhat commonplace pursuit of the nineteenth century ideals of material advancement, whatever character of heroism it has. An association of thirty years with these men has given me an unusual opportunity to form a judgment as to their opinions. I feel entirely confident that they will heartily respond to what is said here as to indiscriminate pension legislation. There is a certain delicacy in their position towards those who are accepted as representing the military class, and it is not their province to initiate any movement that might be interpreted as a jealous interference with the rights of others. But it may be considered as certain that they will be found heartily in sympathy with whatever tends to elevate the soldierly character in public esteem, or to save it from the reproaches brought upon it by those who, without sufficient warrant, assume to represent it in the demand for indiscriminate pensioning for war service.

WILLIAM CONANT CHURCH.

ART OF MYSTERY IN FICTION.

BY GEORGE MANVILLE FENN.

THE original inventor of the legend of how a man sold himself to the Prince of Darkness, taking for his share of the bargain renewed youth and unbounded riches, certainly deserves to be awarded the palm for the most wondrous and mysterious plot that ever emanated from the human brain. He must have been a deep thinker, one well versed in the philosophy of goose quill, knowing that his story would thrill the reader, and that he had achieved the great point of seizing upon that reader's imagination, and holding it, so that he would follow the mystery of the fiction to the very end. It may have been the result of some haphazard lucky thought, but still he must have been a careful student of every-day life, and must have duly noted how largely curiosity or the desire to fathom the unknown is developed in the human brain. It is possible even to descend lower in the scale of creation and to find this quality in creatures which progress on four hands or four feet, and to note how frequently the hunter lures the unfortunate quarry to death by holding forth something novel to its gaze. But, setting aside the beast of the field, it is sufficient to recall how very soon in infant life a pair of little wondering eyes begin, in the nurse's parlance, "to take notice," and how, before long, the use of the curious eyes is supplemented by a tiny, outstretched, feeling hand, trying to touch that something before it which is unknown. The child grows, and with its growth the desire increases, and, to speak broadly, becomes an insatiable desire to know what is on the other side of the wall that he cannot climb. In his simplicity he is the Simon of nursery lore, who cut open his mother's bellows to see whence came the wind. A much-maligned youth, by the way; for his simplicity was only the natural thirst for knowledge of a mystery; and, after all, he was somewhat of a philosopher studying pneumatics, and possibly wiser than his judges. As the ordinary Simon of every-day life matures and becomes

versed in his many studies, we find him still seeking after the meanings of the many mysteries of life, and dabbling in science as chemist, or as astronomer, puzzling out the why and wherefore of the worlds around; perhaps even turning to occultism as an earnest student, or as a victim of the charlatan; and, above all, sooner or later, trying to dive into the mysteries of the great unknown—the future.

It is this strong passion to know the unknown that is seized upon by the writer of a certain class of fiction, who realizing the vastness of his audience, and calculating his probabilities in prizes to be won in the shape of notoriety, publisher's smiles, and their consequences, throws over his natural desires to follow out the so-called higher paths of literature with the delineation and analysis of character, and in the first pages of his work seeks to start his reader off upon the hunt after a mystery. The flaire is prepared, the scent is there, and the hunt for the elucidation begins. If cleverely arranged the hunter grows warmer and more breathless chapter by chapter, and at this rate he would soon run the mystery down; but he is carried off on false leads, disappointed, sent back to the true, and goes on with repetitions of the trick of which he is delightfully ignorant, till the last chapter is near, the quarry—the mystery—almost in sight, and finally, after a breathless chase, the aim of writer and reader is achieved.

Without going back to the most ancient utilizers of the hidden in fiction, it is a far-enough cry from the *Mysteries of Udolpho,* to the *Mysteries of a Hansom Cab;* from secret passage, dark dungeon, and strange appearances, to murder most foul and unnatural. Between those two points how innumerable have been the devices adopted to catch the reader's attention!

A goodly list of literary devices might be catalogued from the thousands of stories poured forth from the press, and it is food for the student to watch the hold they take upon the ordinary—even upon the extraordinary—reader, who is easily attracted to the mystery chase if that mystery be good. It may be dressed with a curdling thrill like that of De Montepin, who starts his readers upon the trail of a horror in the cemetery of Père la Chaise, with the strange and gruesome idea suggestive of the natural, supernatural, and always of the ghastly—the discovery of a thin stream of blood issuing from beneath the stony door of one of the more

pretentious tombs ; or one of the ingenious complications full of the detective element contrived by Gaboriau or Boisgobey ; or the myst tery of a higher class arranged with its masterly sexual attractions, of the personage prisoned in the gloomy mansion who startled governess *Jane Eyre* with her nightly shrieks. Again, who amongst us was not fascinated by the fortunes of the beautiful bigamist whose first husband so mysteriously disappeared, and who did not long to penetrate *Lady Audley's Secret,* even feeling ready to forgive its rather vapid ending for the sake of the enjoyment experienced while under the clever novelist's spell ?

Then we have the well-used, never-failing mystery followed as intently in real life as in fiction, the unravelling of that poisoning case which, once begun, has a perfect magnetism for the reader, whose stimulated mind goads him or her on in the chase with piquant questions. For there is first the sufferer dying by inches from that unknown fell disease which baffles all the physicians' skill—that is, the fiction physicians—for they remain chapters long in utter ignorance of the mysterious ailment. Then the discovery : it is produced by poison. But what poison ? The symptoms are new to science. No deadly drug in the pharmacopœia would produce these effects. How could it have been administered ? By what means ? The suggestions are many—so many little mysteries to make one big—and when it is settled that the victim is being slowly poisoned, comes the leading up to the questions of who could be the administrator, and for what reason is the unfortunate being gradually done to death. Here is plenty of choice for the writer to gratify his reader : love, hatred, revenge, rivalry, hard cash, or, strongest of all—very telling this—for psychical reasons, to see a victim die.

Mystery is a strong card in the novelist's hand. By few has it been played with a skill like that of Wilkie Collins, who, with little characterization or sentiment, without creating individuals of fiction whom we remember, or whose sayings we quote, could hold the attention of the novel-reading world with his *Woman in White,* or set them eagerly agog to find the whereabouts of the mysterious diamond taken from its Eastern sanctuary. For ingenuity of construction, blind leads, bafflings, and sustained interest *The Moonstone* stands high in the catalogue of the mysteries of fiction ; and the reader was penetrating to a degree who fastened upon Mr. Godfrey Ablewhite the theft, the

point being most graphically and tragically revealed in the scene in the East End where he lay a corpse.

It is not great, perhaps, this art of mystery in fiction, partaking as it does of the nature of a puzzle or conundrum ; still it is ingenious though stagy, with its designing and fitting, and surely to be commended as an art worthy of a meed of praise. Especially now that we have reached in reading a period when we are going through a transition stage which to the thoughtful is most marked. The novels of a century or so back were manly but coarse, and many a clever work retains its place on the bookshelves on account of its being licensed in its licentiousness by the brand, or hall mark, "classic." Then, as refinement obtained, we went through a phase of the morbidly sentimental, followed up by the sentimental romantic, which gave place in turn to productions of sterling worth lasting up to and continued in the present day. In company with all these, of course, there were the importations from across the Channel—clever, unprincipled, immoral, often filthy to a degree. In these, for the most part, the art of mystery was wanting. There was no room for it. The text was in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred sexuality. These had their readers naturally enough, but the hot-blooded exotic novel was neither popular nor plentiful. Now we have changed all that. Another French fashion has been imported ; it has obtained its hold upon a largely increasing *clientèle* of readers, and is dubbed the gospel of nature. By them the honest, straightforward is pooh-poohed ; Scott is a bore, Dickens burlesque, Thackeray tiresome satire, George Eliot old-fashioned and dull. The French novel, in short, a score or so of years ago, was read and not named ; now it is read, and not only named but is answerable for a new school of novelists who base themselves upon their French masters and imitate them as nearly as they dare ; for there are reasons—patent reasons—not unconnected with circulation, which hinder the modern Gallicised writer from going as far as he probably would. We have held up to us as master-pieces of nature and realism, *Manon Lescaut, Madame Bovary,* and the sham philosophic but mighty efforts of a great brain, the works of Zola. One casts no slur upon the ability of the writers of these romances. They are Frenchmen, of France, and their ways are not ours. But the insidious work is going on and is having its

effect. Naturally our writers are ruled by the demand. The success of one brings forth many imitators, and the result is that many of the books now published, notably those written by the so-called weaker sex, grow broader and stronger—certainly in more senses than one. The school of writers to whom we owe this advance, this imitative effort in letters, scorning the art of mystery in fiction, claim for their work that it is in its breadth and strength more masculine—they might add feminine, though the reader may wade through many a novel without finding a true woman—nothing but the animal feminine whom the Frank delights to portray. The influence is daily growing, and an example of its effects is plainly before us—an example almost ludicrous—for we find one of our principal newspapers giving its assurance (in answer to certain rumors) that the novel appearing in its columns has not been expurgated, but is exactly as it came from the novelist's pen.

One might expect that with the advance of this class of narrative with naturalism so strongly to the fore, the old school of sensationalism would be beaten out of the field, but though the new writer basing his fiction upon his French master may out-Herod Herod and cause a massacre among the innocents he contemns, the mystery-lover will never be convinced, but will seek after his favorite food with as great a zest as ever. There is nothing repellent here: the natural desire to penetrate the occult is evoked, and in this lies the power which has won for many a work utterly wanting in truth to nature, plausibility and literary style—a work in fact of the most crude and rugged type—a fabulous circulation. It would be invidious to name such books, to pose as a judge, and give what at best would be only one opinion, but the question must have been asked by many a reader how it was that such farragoes of impossibilities—such tragi-burlesque played by abortive imitations of human life—could have enthralled their hundreds of thousands, and kept their attention from the beginning to the end. The answer is simple. It is the mystery of the story and the curiosity excited. These have a peculiar charm for most readers—most, for a tale of this kind with an ingenious, well-constructed plot partakes somewhat of the nature of the fabled Maelstrom. Even the lover of the vapid style of society novel, or of those dealing with afternoon calls and tea, liberally amalgamated with upholstery and the latest fashions; the

lady worshipper of the athletic giants who crush the gentle violets of society and break hearts because it is their nature to, and consequently go on macadamizing their life path with these brittle objects so liberally offered to them—in novels; the patron of the libraries who is content with nothing less than character-studies, analysis of life, struggles against temptation, sexual or religious infidelity, stories of pure-minded church dignitaries fighting against doubt, or Barham's worst devil of all—the "laughing woman with two bright eyes," and who go through three volumes representing in Book I. the flitting fly, in Book II. the contact with the web and the vain struggles, and in Book III. the rescue and cleansing of the tangled wings by faith, fighting or death; all these readers fall at times to the ordinary mystery in fiction. Their nature is too strong for them. The cover of the popular-sensation story is lifted with possibly a smile of contempt for the people who can "devour such stuff," and of course just to skim a few pages to see what it may be like. Or it may be by accident, for want of something better to hand. Then a few lines are read, and could the ingenious writer be looking on, and always supposing that in cleverness of construction and freshness of idea the story is one of the best of its class, he too could have his smile for the great-browed deep thinker and student of the higher questions and theories of the nineteenth century. For the reader has placed one foot in the literary whirlpool, the other follows, and in the vast majority of cases complete immersion ensues; he starts on his career round and round, lost to everything but the insidious curiosity-exciting plot of the book, till the brain hunger is excited, and with the desire thoroughly piqued, he reads on to the very end. Then the book is thrown down—possibly with a contemptuous, "What trash!"

One joins issue here. Is it such trash when it has been so constructed and so written that it has kept the reader's brain spellbound, held the attention not only for the time occupied in reading three ordinary library volumes, but often in a tantalized state from month to month—six, or even twelve—when the work has appeared in periodical or magazine? These effects are produced by a combination of nature and art; nature worked upon by art most artfully; but it is given to few—this power of piquing a reader's brain. Once touched, though, the novelist has a

wonderful ally in his victim, who colors up the pictures, and represents them to his mind's eye to suit his own taste, and often renders that which is dull bright in the extreme—to himself.

One might exemplify how strongly this is the case in many of the stories of adventure that have been written for boys, which, so to speak, have been merely skeletons—hard, dry bones, but well set up, strong, and perfectly articulated. Every joint has been carefully placed, and the form is without a flaw. Then comes the young reader to the mysterious bones, eager and full of curiosity. His vivid young imagination begins to work, and in a very short time that skeleton is clothed by him—not by the author—with elastic tendon, vigorous muscle, and a color of which the writer has hardly dreamed. The skeleton is alive and full of action, while the scene in which it begins to move and have its being impresses itself so upon the soft wax of the youthful imagination that it lasts there unabraded by a life of toil and care. And, though in a less degree, the adult reader, albeit his or her brain is a little thicker in its *pia* or *dura mater*, and more difficult to impress, also helps the author in his work. One who has studied these questions from many points of view, and, above all, noted how a story will "catch on," and almost electrically seize the imagination of the reading world, will constantly see that in the majority of cases the most popular fiction of the day is that in which mystery plays a prominent part—a mystery which is well concealed. It is no secret. There as aforesaid is the natural desire for the weird and wonderful—that hunger for the knowledge of the unknown which began with the forbidden apple; and the practiser of the art in question merely grows for those who hunger a fruit that is goodly to the eye, agreeable to the taste, and one that if he—or she—be worthy of the honored name of author, should only contain in its seeds a sufficiency of hydrocyanic poison to make it piquant in its savor. It is no forbidden fruit that he should offer, only an apple that is hard to pick, now within the grasp, now hidden amongst the leaves of the bright garden in which the reader is lured to stray, and rest and refresh, away from life s carking care —a fruit whose first bite excites fresh desire, whose taste brings forth an intense longing for more, and of which the choicest and most enticing morsel is cleverly held back to the very end.

GEORGE MANVILLE FENN.

THE INTERIOR OF THE EARTH.

BY GEORGE F. BECKER, OF THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

It is a matter for surprise that the alarmists who from time to time predict the impending destruction of the world pay so little attention to the opportunities which geology offers them. By making two or three assumptions, each largely accepted, such a prophet could work out a scene of horror well calculated to make the stoutest heart grow faint.

A very large part of the educated public believes that the earth is a molten globe superficially enveloped by a chilled crust, and a magazine article in support of such a theory has recently attracted much attention. Very many of the natural philosophers consider it most probable that the rocks at and near the surface of the globe would expand in melting. If the earth were thus constituted a time would come when the solid crust would crack from its own weight, or from some moderate internal disturbance; and then block after block of the crust, region after region of the world we know and love so well, would plunge slowly and heavily to meet the rising, molten flood, while whirlwinds of scalding steam would shroud perishing humanity.

It would require a Dante to do justice to the tragic side of this theme. A hard-hearted physicist would simply remark that a crust of such dimensions resting on a fluid of inferior density is in unstable equilibrium; the rest being an evident consequence. Statements such as this are commonly considered as extremely uninteresting; but the Dantesque view of the subject has been indicated sufficiently to show that the earth's interior is within the sphere of human interest. Aside from ignoble fears, there seems scarcely any topic better suited to excite a legitimate intel-

lectual interest among men than this most fundamental question concerning that little planet, our world. Is it a molten globe with a pellicle of cool dry land, or is it really *terra firma*, a solid earth ?

It would be interesting to trace the rise and progress of the two existing and opposed opinions on this question, but economy of space forbids more than the barest outline of such a sketch. The Greeks and Romans recognized the existence of melted lavas beneath the surface, though not supposing the whole interior of the earth fluid. Descartes, in 1644, seems to have been the first to give expression to the opinion, still so widely entertained, that the earth is a fiery globe, superficially encrusted. Newton and Laplace on the other hand assumed that the earth was solid ; and, indeed, incapable of deformation by the attraction of the moon or sun.

Laplace and his successors were not led by their own investigations to abandon the idea of a solid earth as inconsistent with known phenomena, for their study of the tides on an ideally rigid globe have been in great measure verified by observation. Indeed, when the irregularities of the sea bottom and of the sea shores are taken into consideration, it seems strange that human ingenuity could have advanced so far towards a satisfactory accounting for the facts. Evidently, then, these results were sufficient justification for the assumption that the earth behaved like a mass approaching ideal rigidity, or presenting great resistance to deformation. On the other hand geologists in Laplace's day were substantially unanimous in regarding the earth from Descartes' point of view as an incrusted globe, the interior of which was liquid. There are indeed arguments for this opinion which are not lightly to be disposed of, and which could not have been fully answered early in the century. It will be well to state these reasons first and then to examine them.

One of them rests upon the observed fact that, in mines and other artificial excavations, the temperature of the rocks increases as one descends from the surface, the increase being about one degree Fahrenheit for every sixty-four feet, or more than eighty-two degrees per mile. Hence an enormous temperature must exist at depths of twenty or thirty miles, one which would probably suffice to melt most rocks existing at the surface ; at least under those conditions with which we are familiar. A condition

with which we are not at all familiar is the immense pressure existing at such depths. Again, the eruption of lavas, which probably first led to the idea of internal heat, seems an argument for the existence of reservoirs of melted rock, if not for general subterranean fluidity. Strongest of all in the minds of many geologists is the argument derived from the crumpling and rupture of rocks. It is absolutely certain that areas of sediment, which were laid down in seas or lakes as substantially horizontal layers of mud or sand, have not only hardened to firm rock but have been bent, twisted and folded to an extraordinary extent. They are sometimes as minutely and as sharply flexed as a crumpled pocket handkerchief. If the superficial portion of the earth is a crust floating on a cooling shrinking fluid, it might perhaps pucker like the skin of a drying orange ; and indeed mountain ranges are no larger in proportion to the earth than the tiny folds of a shrivelled orange skin are in proportion to the orange.

None of these argumeuts is wholly conclusive. There are certain substances, of which ice and cast-iron are the most important, which contract in melting; and pressure (within certain limits) facilitates their fusion because it coöporates with heat to reduce the volume of the mass. This class is a limited one. All other substances expand in fusing, and pressure, by opposing this expansion, impedes their fusion. Now it has long been known from experiments that rocks may be fused to glassy slags, and that these slags when cold are much less dense than the rocks from which they are derived. Glasses and glassy slags themselves also expand in melting, or shrink in solidifying. It is for this reason that moulded glass utensils have rounded edges and cannot be made closely to imitate cut-glass. Thus cold rocks are denser than the melted glasses into which heat converts them.*

More satisfactory in some respects than any experiments are observations which I have made in the Yosemite Valley and other deep cañons of the Sierra Nevada. In that region there are

* Very numerous experiments have been made on the change in density in rocks and minerals due to fusion and, indeed, by investigators of great distinction. Among them are C. Sainte-Claire Deville, Thoulet, Rammelsberg, Abich and Magnus. Many of the data are collected by Professor Justus Roth in his Allgemeine Geologie, vol. 2, 1883, page 51. They all show a diminution of density by fusion, for the most part of very large amount. Thus granite and allied rocks increase in bulk by about ten per cent. when fused.

Certain anomalous results obtained by Mr. Joseph Whitley, of Leeds, for granite and whinstone cannot outweigh scores of experiments by the ablest investigators.

many narrow dikes of a light colored granite which must have cooled under a "head" of several thousand feet of melted rock. Under such pressure the liquid rock must have filled the cracks it occupied very completely. In hundreds of cases, however, flat, lenticular openings have formed along the centres of these dikes while the rock was solidifying and crystallizing. This is a conconclusive proof that the material shrank, or that the volume of the rock diminished, in passing from the fluid to the solid state.

It is substantially certain from such facts that pressure would impede the fusion of rocks by counteracting the expansive tendency which accompanies fusion. Consequently a given rock at a depth of several miles below the surface would melt only at a higher temperature than would suffice to fuse it at the surface.

More precise information as to the relations between melting point and pressure was highly desirable and indeed constituted one of the great desiderata of physical geology. This has lately been obtained by Dr. Carl Barus, at the instigation of Mr. Clarence King, for a very typical rock.* This is the material of the Palisades on the Hudson; it covers large areas in northern New Jersey, and is in fact very abundant throughout the world. It is called diabase and sometimes basalt. Dr. Barus showed that this rock expands in melting, that the temperature at which it melts increases with the pressure, and that the increase in this temperature is simply proportional to the increase in pressure. He found also that various other substances, such as wax and paraffine, behave in substantially the same way as diabase so far as the relation of melting point to pressure is concerned; and there is practically no doubt that granitic rocks would show the same relation, since it is known that they yield a glass specifically lighter than the unfused rock, just as diabase does.

Now unless the temperature increases in passing from the surface of the earth towards its centre so fast as to overtake the melting point of the rock (which rises with pressure) no portion of the earth can be fluid. Just how fast the temperature rises at considerable distances cannot, however, be determined directly; so that the fine work mentioned in the last paragraph, taken by itself, only shows that the distribution of temperature in the earth *may* be such as to produce no general fusion of the rocks. Thus it does not follow that because the temperature rises with

* *Am. Jour. Sci.*, vol. 43, 1892, p. 56, and vol. 45, 1893, p. 1.

increasing depth from the surface, the interior *must* be fluid, and one of the supposed grounds for concluding that the inner earth is a molten mass is untenable.

As for the evidence of volcanoes, they do not even tend to show a general fluidity of the interior, any more than springs of water in the Alps prove that the interior of that range is a subterranean lake. Volcanoes do not even show that there are permanent reservoirs of melted matter beneath the surface. If the rocks at a few miles below the surface are kept from melting only by the pressure, a relief of pressure would cause them to melt. Similarly when a boiler bursts, the water being above the ordinary boiling point flashes instantly into steam. Consequently volcanic eruptions may possibly be due to relief of pressure by cracks from the surface, and no permanent reservoirs of melted lava are then requisite. Or, again, the melting may be induced in the highly heated solid rock by a small accession of heat due to local mechanical action, such as "faulting." A third possibility is of a chemical nature. All melted lavas contain water, and are to some extent in a condition of so-called aquo-igneous fusion. This fusion in the presence of water (under a pressure which prevents the escape of steam) takes place at a lower temperature than dry fusion and, within certain limits, the more water the mass contains the more easily it will melt. Hence water, percolating through cracks or even pores of the rock to great depths, may sometimes so reduce the point of fusion of the material in this way that it will pass into the liquid state without either relief from pressure or accession of temperature. This hypothesis would contribute to an explanation of the eruptions of the Hawaiian volcanos where there is nothing to indicate the presence of deep cracks or active faulting. On the whole, then, volcanoes do not imply the presence even of permanent reservoirs of fluid lava, much less the fluidity of the whole interior of the earth.

As for the deformation and wrinkling of the rocks near the earth's surface, it is a subject upon which much light has been thrown since the middle of the century. When one bends a bit of lead, copper, or tallow the particles of the mass slide past one another, very much as the leaves of a book do when it is opened or shut, and remain nearly in the position into which they are forced. This relative inelastic movement among the particles is called the "flow of solids" by Tresca, and such flow takes place

whenever a mass stays bent or otherwise deformed after the force is relieved. In ordinary experience only soft solids, such as those mentioned, flow sensibly. But under slowly applied forces, gradually increasing in intensity, even glass and hard steel flow, as experiment proves.

Rock exposures often show in an unmistakable manner the phenomena of solid flow. In particular, many conglomerates, or pudding stones, are found to have been moulded by pressure, something as if they had been reduced to a pasty condition; yet not really thus, for the details of structure prove that the pebbles have obeyed the law of solid flow, not those of liquid flow. The distinction is most marked, but it cannot be explained here for lack of space.*

If, then, the rocks yield, in large measure at least, by solid flow (pushed to an extent which the feeble resources of experiment cannot reproduce), it is quite unnecessary to assume that the earth as a whole has received its superficial plications by a different process. If the external shell of the earth, say ten or twenty miles in thickness, is crumpled by processes identical with those which twist and bend the steel beams of a collapsing railway bridge or of a falling building, a thicker shell, perhaps the outer one or two hundred miles of the globe, would yield in the same way, only more completely because of its greater weight. In other words, the contortion of the superficial rocks does not necessarily imply any fluid interior or substratum.

Thus none of the reasoning from which a fluid interior has been inferred is convincing; and indeed it may be concluded that simple examination of the earth's surface, however careful, is essentially inadequate to solve the question at issue.

"Papa," one may fancy Miss Edgeworth's Frank inquiring, "is this a solid rubber ball or only a hollow one filled with some liquid?" That idealized parent would not have replied: "Let me get out my microscope and carefully examine the surface of your toy." No, indeed! He would have answered: "Pinch it, my son, and judge for yourself."

Though the earth is too large for the immediate application of this method, the sun and the moon do really drag the earth out of shape with a tremendous energy adequate to the occasion. Do they deform the globe as if it were solid, or as if it were filled

* Bulletin Geological Soc. of Amer., vol. 4, 1893, p. 46.

with fluid? This is the best test of the question which can possibly be suggested. It was not an easy matter to substitute computation for the muscular sense which would have led Frank to a correct conclusion. The earth retains pretty nearly a constant shape in part by the attraction of gravity. If it is a solid mass its elasticity also opposes the deforming action of the sun and moon. Laplace showed how the earth would behave if it resisted deformation only by gravity. Lamé showed how a supposed solid sphere would resist deformation if only its elasticity came into play. Lord Kelvin (then Sir William Thomson) combined these results and compared them with observations on the actual deformation.* The problem as thus solved is one of great mathematical complexity, but I have shown that Lamé's results can be dispensed with for the purposes of this inquiry, and that the solution can be reached without loss of stringency by a very simple method.† The conclusion, however reached, is this:

If the earth were fluid and had a very thin crust the earth as a whole would be drawn towards the moon and sun substantially as the water of the ocean is attracted; so that there would be a "bodily" tide in the earth as a whole twice a day; and this tide would be about as great as the oceanic tides are. Thus the coasts and the ocean would rise and fall together. What we recognize as a tide is simply the difference between the rise of the sea and the rise of the land. If the crust were thin this difference would be insensible or, in other words, we should not perceive the tides at the seashore any more than we perceive them from the deck of a vessel at sea. Shore and sea would rise and fall together.

Thus the mere fact that there are tides shows that the earth offers effective resistance to deformation. The next question is how great is this resistance. Lord Kelvin, and afterwards Professor G. H. Darwin, have computed how the resistance displayed by the earth to tidal deformation compares with that which a globe as elastic as solid, continuous glass would present. They find that a glass globe would certainly yield more freely than the earth. They have also compared it with a globe of steel, and they conclude that the earth resists the attraction of the sun and moon nearly or quite as much as a solid continuous globe of steel would do.

Now it is hard to imagine that the earth is as strong as steel,

* See Thomson and Tait, Natural Philosophy, section 834.
†*Am. Jour. Sci.*, vol. 39, 1890, p. 336.

still harder to fancy that it is stronger. But if the world consists of even a very thick shell (say five hundred miles in thickness) inclosing a fluid mass, this shell must be far stronger than steel or any other substance known to men. Hence, finally, it is substantially certain that the earth is solid to (or close to) the centre.*

Some geologists have demurred to this conclusion, for it is hard to give up opinions which have been considered certain and fundamental; but only one serious attempt has been made to account for the acknowledged fact of the enormous effective resistance of the earth to the tide-producing forces consistently with a fluid interior. This attempt is due to Reverend Osmond Fisher,† and his speculation has recently been restated by the famous zoölogist, Mr. Alfred Wallace, in the *Fortnightly Review* for November. One may consider the attraction of the moon as tending to produce two distinct changes in the earth; one a change of shape, the other a change of bulk or volume. Now Mr. Fisher supposed (quite erroneously) that Lord Kelvin had omitted to consider the earth as capable of changes of volume, and he maintained that the effect of this capacity would be to counteract the tendency to change of shape. This is simply a mistake. It can be and it has been shown, on unquestionable mechanical principles, that volume change would diminish the total effective resistance of the earth to tidal force and reduce the apparent height of the tides.††

A solid rubber ball, though very elastic, is nearly incapable of change of volume; but there is a kind of spongy rubber, used for erasing drawings, which is full of small vesicles or "air holes," and a ball of this material can easily be reduced in bulk. Now Mr. Fisher's proposition is equivalent to this: If one were to make a ball of spongy rubber containing the right proportion of vesicles, the ball would be as rigid as if it were made of steel. So stated Mr. Fisher's hypothesis is incredible, nor has it been accepted by competent judges.

Lord Kelvin's argument has not been weakened by any objection yet advanced against it, while the theory has received support from Professor Darwin's discussion of tides, and still

* W. Hopkins' argument for solidity from precession has been shown to be untenable. An account of it is omitted to save space.

† Physics of the Earth's Crust, second edition, 1889.

†† *Amer. Jour. Sci.*, vol. 39, 1890, p. 336.

more strikingly from results recently announced by Professor Simon Newcomb.

It is known to all readers of newspapers that, in recent years, some small varying changes in latitude have been detected at astronomical observations, and Mr. S. C. Chandler has discovered that these changes are periodic, so that the telescopes come back to the same latitude after a certain period. From a great number of observations in the two Americas, England and continental Europe, Newcomb finds this period four hundred and thirty days. The cause is probably unusual accumulations of ice and snow near, but not at, one or other of the poles. A temporary additional load of snow confined, for example, to Greenland would very slightly change the axis about which the earth would rotate. Now if the earth were ideally rigid (as Laplace considered it in his theory of tides) this new axis, as has long been known, would shift its position along a conical surface described about the old axis, and this progressive change of the axis of rotation would cause a change of latitude such as that detected, but with a period of only three hundred and six days. Newcomb finds that if the earth is not ideally rigid the length of this period must be increased, so that if the earth were deprived of all rigidity, or were fluid throughout, the length of the period would be infinite. Making certain probable assumptions as to the behavior of the ocean, and supposing that the earth as a whole resists deformation as much as steel, he finds that the length of the period would increase to four hundred and forty-one days, or only eleven days more than the observed period. Thus if the assumptions as to the behavior of the ocean are exact, the effective resistance of the earth is a little greater than that of steel, and in any case the earth presents just about that degree of resistance.*

The investigation of Messrs. King and Barus mentioned above revitalizes an argument for the solidity of the earth, put forward long ago by Lord Kelvin, and referred to at the beginning of this paper. Assuming that rocks would expand in melting, he pointed out that the crusts formed on the surface would break up and sink in the molten mass. Subsequently, because of some very inadequate experiments which were interpreted as indicating that rocks contract in melting, he withdrew this ar-

* Newcomb's investigations are set forth in two distinct papers, *Monthly Notices Royal Astronomical Society*, vol. lii., 1892, p. 336, and *Astronomische Nachrichten*, vol. cxxx., 1892, p. 1.

gument. The careful work of the American investigators shows that Lord Kelvin's original assumption and conclusion were entirely correct.*

In conclusion, then, all the arguments which have not been shown to be inconclusive or false indicate that the earth presents a resistance to deformation about as great as if it were a solid steel ball, and that it actually is solid to, or nearly to, the centre. The permanent deformations to which it has been subjected near the surface are enormous, and their amount is seldom appreciated by astronomers or physicists; but these deformations have been produced for the most part by the "flow of solids," and there is no known incompatibility between such distortions and the theory of a solid earth. The public may accept the theory of *Terra Firma* in peace, and those geologists who attempt to combat it can scarcely fail to lose their labor.

GEORGE F. BECKER.

* The conclusions in this paragraph are entirely inconsistent with the hypothesis that the earth's interior resembles very stiff sealing wax or asphalt substances which are known as "ultra-viscous fluids." This idea must also be rejected on other grounds, an explanation of which is not needful here.

TWO ENGLISHWOMEN ON AMERICA.

I.—BY LADY GREY-EGERTON.

IT WAS on a very hot day at the end of last July that we landed at Vancouver, but the sunshine and heat were simply delightful to us, as we had come across the Pacific from Yokohama, and had suffered from fog the whole way. We came into the fog the day after leaving and never quite shook it off till we were in sight of America. Sometimes it lifted just a little, giving us hopes of clear weather, but it shut down again and the ship panted and throbbed on with everything cold, damp and clammy to the touch and with wet and slippery decks.

This being our first visit to America we were eagerly on the lookout for all differences between it and the old country, but we were delighted to find that we felt as if we were again in England and seemed very much at home. For ten months we had been travelling in strange countries—some of them very strange indeed—and now again we heard our own language familiarly spoken and saw faces most unmistakably English all around us; it seemed very pleasant and homelike. But at our hotel we sadly missed the friendly little Japanese waiters and waitresses to whom we had been so long accustomed, who were but indifferently replaced by the magnificent and supercilious gentlemen who condescended at their leisure to bring us the menu. After hearing our selections therefrom they would stroll off to some unknown region, leaving us to a dreary and impatient wait of half an hour, more or less, and return at last balancing a tray loaded with small dishes which they crowded pell mell on the table before us. It was a very unsatisfactory way of being served and I never could reconcile myself to it, or to that long waiting period. In vain we tipped the waiters and tried in

various ways to curry favor with them; nothing was ever of any avail, and all through America we suffered from that long pause and from the untidily arranged mass of unappetizing dishes.

We remained only three or four days at Vancouver, but I cannot say we found it as uninteresting as had been prophesied. Only six years ago the whole town was destroyed by fire, yet a flourishing and rapidly-increasing city has already sprung up, laid out in wide streets with wooden sidewalks and planks serving as street pavements, over which the light carriages drawn by really very nice-looking horses rattle and bump in truly backwoods' fashion. The town is lighted by electricity and has electric street cars; is full of handsome banks, offices and warehouses, and of large shops and stores of all kinds. Truly in America the world moves fast! Here and there are vacant places in the streets showing where the land has not yet been bought up for building purposes, but the arrival of yet more commerce and enterprise is awaited and confidently looked for to fill up these gaps. Whole streets there are of pretty detached wooden dwelling-houses, with creepers growing over them, each standing in its lawn of well-kept grass. In the distance glimpses are caught of tall pine trees rising up behind the houses like the masts of many ships, which tell of the yet uncleared forest on the outskirts of the town. We drove in the public park, which is at present but a large tract of forest land with well-made drives winding about among trees often gigantic; we picnicked at the saw-mill on the opposite shore of the inlet; we boated on the sea and saw some of the most magnificent sunsets imaginable, with such glorious effects of light and color that they transformed the modern prosaic town of Vancouver into the semblance of a glorified enchanted city; last, but not least, we suffered from the mosquitoes, which at sunset came out from the forest trees in their myriads and attacked us with a persistence and a concentrated essence of venom extremely irritating both to temper and skin.

On landing at Vancouver our first impression had been, how like it was to England, but during these few days we had learned, on the contrary, how unlike it is. Everywhere was evidence that things were merely temporary, that they had been put up in the rough to be replaced presently by something better. Then the houses were of wood, the roadways of wood, the paths of

wood; at the saw-mills huge fires were consuming the refuse wood—wood was a glut in the market, for forest land was everywhere. The vast tracts of uncultivated country extending for untold miles seemed to impress the imagination and to make us more than half colonists ourselves, as we were led to picture both their difficulties and their joys. And the men and women round us seemed different too; they were still unmistakably Anglo-Saxon, but they looked eager, bright, hopeful. Whatever might be their class, in their faces it was written that they saw before them—possibilities; which they meant to reach, or at any rate to try to reach; and nowhere was that stolid look of hopeless endurance, which I have, alas! so often seen elsewhere.

Patient endurance has its merit, but it is apt to stunt and stupefy the mind. Here there was none of it; patience would be useless, and speculation was in the air; every creature invested what he or she could; the assistants in the shops, the waiters at the hotel, the drivers of the flys—all had their pet fancies, and earned their money and laid it out as they hoped to the best advantage; and I, too, was seized with the universal craze and had to try my little venture. A few days ago I came across the parchment which represents that little venture, but the spirit of speculation had deserted me and I found myself wondering if it would ever be worth more than the paper on which it is written.

We found that five days and nights of railway travelling lay before us, to be followed by three on a steamer through Lakes Superior and Huron, and then finally there would still be a few hours by train before we reached Niagara, where we were to leave Canada and to enter the States. It seemed an endless journey, and my heart began to sink. But the Canadian Pacific Railway officials took us in hand, and all at once became *couleur de rose*. They treated the whole thing as a matter of course; they advised us where to stop and what to see; told us at what place to ask for further advice and from whom to ask it; thus passing us on from one stopping place and from one official to another, so that the whole of that long and formidable journey went on swimmingly and pleasantly, without hitch or drawback. We found that the first and most important point was always to make sure of the drawing-room car, which has a small compartment containing two sleeping berths at the end, in which the occupants are perfectly comfort-

able and private, an impossibility elsewhere; and I could only wonder at the discomfort to which the ladies of America resign themselves in the ordinary sleeping cars. Our little drawing-room was charming; fitted up in serge green plush and satinwood, with the softest of sofas, it almost approached the dignity of a boudoir, which it certainly was in size; at night two berths let down—broad and comfortable ones, well provided with fine sheets and pillow slips. Four days and nights in a railway train sounds interminable, and cannot help at times being wearisome; but, even so, there was a certain amount of variety. For the first half of the journey there was an observation car on the train—a long, bare carriage with merely a bench down the centre and with the sides all windows, to which we could make periodical expeditions and from which we could see the scenery to great advantage. Our meals were served in restaurant cars, which were taken up and dropped again at fixed stations, where we used to eat under difficulties, the train being much given to sudden bumps and shakings most embarrassing in the consumption of soup; but sometimes—which was far more pleasant—the train reached a restaurant building, standing a little back from the line, with garden and lawn in front of it, and then the whole trainful alighted, to find a large, airy dining-room ready set out with numerous little tables, many neatly-dressed waitresses in attendance and a menu which was really very well selected, or appeared to be so to hungry travellers who had been shut up in a train for many hours. There was always time for a stroll in the garden afterwards before we all collected round the carriages again ready for the start. When the prairie country was reached there were still the occasional stoppages, when everyone gladly stepped out of the train and sought such diversion as might be found in watching the grey squirrels hopping about in the long grass, and in picking the wild flowers that grow in profusion by the side of the line, common enough evidently in Canada, but new and strange to us Britishers.

Railway stations in America are not designed on the magnificent scale that prevails in England and Europe generally; the strictly necessary seems all that is attended to, and the grand or handsome quite left out of account. Insignificant buildings and a narrow platform, quickly blocked up by luggage, is what the stations in America generally con-

sist of. Often in the States the passengers are set down and taken up anywhere in the station, even where there is no platform, when they have to straggle across the lines to where their next train is waiting for them, or to find their way across the rails to the station buildings. To those used to European ways of travelling this seems a crude and dangerous way of proceeding, but presumably habit teaches caution, or there must be many accidents. A friend told me that one day at a railway station soon after landing at New York he said to a man lounging near, whom he took for a porter, "Just shoulder this portmanteau, my man." The man looked at the portmanteau and then at him. "Shoulder it yourself," he replied, as he turned on his heel. In America I am certain it is best to mind your own business.

The scenery through which we passed for six hundred miles after leaving Vancouver till we reached the prairie country on the other side of the Rocky Mountains was simply marvellous. I have been in many countries all over the world and have seen much beautiful scenery, but for extent and impressiveness, for awfulness and majesty, never anything to come near it. At first our way lay along the valley of the great Fraser River, where it rolls swiftly but smoothly on its way to the ocean; and there were mountains on each side of us, but broad and cultivated valleys lay between them; by degrees the valley and the river narrowed, the mountains drew nearer, and the river became rolling and more rapid. On its banks we passed Indian camps, where salmon were hanging on lines to dry, the tiny tents and the smoke of the camp fires giving to the scene a touch of human interest. Every now and then we saw Indians spearing the fish or scooping them out of the river; occasionally on patches of sand or gravel there were Chinamen washing the sand for gold. We passed Yale, a town where Indian tents, European houses, churches and a Chinese joss house, are mixed up in strange confusion, and then the train turned a corner and suddenly plunged into the far-famed Fraser Cañon. For twenty-three miles the river rushes and foams at the bottom of the deep and narrow gorges of the Cascade range of mountains, and the railway follows the course of the river as it winds about among them. High above the river, along the sides of its precipitous cliffs, is cut the track of the railway, sometimes crossing the chasm by a slender bridge; sometimes burrowing by a tunnel through a spur of the cliff. Always there are the precipices

above and the abyss below, with the foaming torrent dashing itself along at the bottom. When we emerged from the Fraser Cañon the evening was closing in. During this first night in the train we passed many of the places with strange, uncouth names that were given in the timetable, and which we were fated, therefore, not to see, but we were up in the morning in time for Craigellachie, where the last nail was driven home to complete the line, and where the rails from the east met those from the west.

Before leaving Vancouver we had secured a permit to ride on the cowcatcher. There had been some difficulty in getting it, as the officials of the Canadian Pacific had rather discouraged the idea, and had tried hard to persuade us that all purposes would be answered by our riding with the engine driver; but then they were obliged to allow that the scenery could be seen very much better from the front of the engine—that, given a strong head, the ride on a cowcatcher was delightful, and that several ladies had done it already. What other ladies had done we felt sure we could do too, and so eventually we received our permit. It desired the engine-driver to let us ride in front of the engine between certain named stations, and it stated that we did so at our own risk and peril and took all danger to life or limb on ourselves. It was rather an alarmingly-worded missive, but we saw that the order was numbered far on into the second hundred, so that we were far from being the first people who had treated themselves to these risks and danger, and we took comfort accordingly.

We found the cowcatcher to be an arrangement of iron bars fastened to the lower part of the front of the engine, and so making a kind of blunt plough in front of it; and it was on the engine with our feet dangling over this cowcatcher that we found we were to sit, one on each side; and there we rode from the foot of the Selkirk Mountains till we reached Glacier House close to the top of the pass. A wonderful two hours' ride that was; the air whizzing past us, the hugh engine panting and grunting at our backs; such a roar in our ears that we couldn't hear each other speak, and mingled feelings of danger and security that were exciting and thrilling indeed. Winding in and out among the mountains the long snake-like train went, swiftly and steadily, almost doubling back sometimes round some sharp curve, shooting across wonderful black wooden trestle bridges, built

just wide enough to take the wheels of the carriages,—skeleton bridges through which the eye could penetrate in every direction and clearly discern the torrent, the Illicilliwaet dashing itself about among the rocks below.

As we got higher up the pass, the train began to dash in and out of the snow sheds, showing where in winter the dreaded snow-slips occur ; and backward and forward across the chasms, and winding about among the snowcapped mountains went the track. Presently came a tunnel, and a tunnel when riding on a cowcatcher is a thing to be remembered ! I saw the narrow track in front of me vanish in a little black hole in the mountain side, and the next moment we were in that black hole and plunged into utter darkness. On and on the train rushed with a deafening noise through the cimmerian blackness. I had a vague feeling that I must hold fast for my life, my only idea the confident one that I should see the light presently ; the cold, heavy, damp air whizzed past me ; my ears were filled with the roar of the train, my eyes ached with staring ahead for the point of light which seemed never coming. Then a tiny flash like a star appeared and in another moment we were out of the black darkness and into the sunshine, with the green trees dancing in the light and the blue sky above us ! Was there ever sky so blue before, or sun that shone so brightly on green pine trees ? Or would ever air again seem so fresh and warm and pure ? We looked at each other across the huge engine, and though we couldn't hear ourselves speak we waved our hands and laughed with joy at being once more out in the open.

Then there were the declines, when we shot down at a pace that seemed likely to take our breath away, and all this time we were passing through the wildest and most glorious scenery, pine-clad and snow-capped mountains piled one on the other in the maddest confusion, with glaciers here and there creeping down their sides. As the track twisted and turned among the mountains we even caught glimpses of others yet more distant, or came upon new precipices and other glaciers, till at last we arrived at the foot of the Great Glacier of the Selkirks, where is Glacier House station and the little hotel at which we had arranged to spend the afternoon and night. At the back of the hotel and station rises out of the glacier ice the barren, naked peak of Sir Donald, and

in every direction are other mountain tops, some too precipitous to give a resting-place to the snow, others wrapped calm and serene in their winter mantles. Looking back we could see the track along which we had come, the turns and twists by which we had climbed the pass, and the famous "loops" which had brought us to the top of it, while far away at the foot of the gorge shone the Illicilliwaet, to the eye at that distance a mere silver thread, but wonderful in spelling and pronunciation.

We visited the glacier, feeling ourselves authorities on glaciers generally, since a visit we had lately paid to Alaska, and we explored the snowsheds on the line—strong wooden sheds built here and there over the track on the mountain sides, so that when in winter a snowslip would otherwise bury the track and any train with it, it falls instead on these stout sheds and slips harmlessly away on its journey further down the mountain. The first year that the line was open no one knew where these snowslips were likely to occur, or understood how best to provide against them, with the result that one train was snowed up for six weeks Now, however, owing to this system of snowsheds, added to constant supervision, the line is kept open and the trains run securely all through the winter. A weird and desolate journey indeed it must be at that time of year !

HENRIETTA GREY-EGERTON.

II.—BY LADY SYKES.

The first visit I made to America took place in August, 1879. We landed on one of the hottest days I ever experienced, even in the tropics, and waited for hours in the burning sun on a very uncomfortable and dirty quay, while every individual article in our abundant baggage was taken out of its case, examined, and disputed over. At this distance of time I am afraid to say how much we paid for duty, but it was relatively an extremely large sum. We drove through miles of ill-paved, badly-kept streets, to the locality where our hotel was situated. Twenty-fourth Street and the surrounding streets were then the centre of fashion in the way of residence. Our hotel, which was considered the very best in New York, was one of the few conducted on European principles; the rooms were small and meanly furnished, the beds hard and uncomfortable, and we had great difficulty in getting sufficient

linen. The restaurant, which was really excellent in comparison with most others then existing in New York, was fair, but I particularly remember how bad and tough all the meat was, and how inferior everything appeared when compared with that which we had left behind us.

The day after arriving we went to Newport where I had my first view of American society. I was young at the time, anxious to amuse myself, and I shall always look back to the month I spent as being quite the pleasantest and happiest I ever remember. The social gatherings were principally composed of very young people, mostly unmarried, although there were many quite elderly ones, particularly men, who entered into the simple pleasures which formed the amusements of the place with as much zest as their juniors. The mode of life was very primitive ; hardly any one dined late ; very few people had men servants ; the dances nearly all took the form of picnics ; the ballroom was generally a boarded floor erected in the open air. I was particularly struck by the politeness, civility and courtesy of the men to the women ; the great attention and respect they showed them, and the gratitude they evinced for a small favor. I was also astonished by the immense kindness and hospitality with which I, a mere stranger, was received. With the exception of one family I did not know a single person there; still everyone tried to make me feel at home and showed me every kindness in their power.

We left Newport after a month's residence, and after travelling for three months in various parts of America returned to New York in December and remained there, save for a few odd weeks' absence, until the following May.

The houses all struck me as being comfortable, but, though generally richly and expensively furnished, they were by no means elegant, and the appointments were generally far too heavy to be in good taste. There were very few large houses. I only remember four or five, and of these the owners of only two or three, at the most, received company. The dinners and luncheons were lavish, but in most cases the cooks were far from perfect. The female society was mostly composed of very young girls, and though the middle-aged and moneyed men continued to go out in the world—the moneyed women generally remained at home. Most American women at that time appeared after they had reached thirty to lose

or imagine they had lost their health and good looks, and with these all inclination to amuse themselves or to take part in whatever might be going on. Of course there were very many notable exceptions.

Nearly all the balls were given on the old Almack principle—a certain number of people subscribed together, issued invitations to a favored few, and then gave the entertainments in various public rooms attached to fashionable restaurants, supper being served in the restaurant itself. The verve, go, and thoroughly enjoyable spirit with which these entertainments were conducted were very pleasing and delightful to me. Having gone through two or three London seasons and remembered the languid way my compatriots crawled through a quadrille, and the very painful and awkward manner in which most of my countrymen (who, alas! do not always learn to dance) bumped their unfortunate partners through a polka, waltz or galop, I was naturally enchanted to find men who could dance, and who were not ashamed to own they liked it. At the few private houses where entertainments were given all was, of course, on a small scale. Guests were never announced; the servants were frequently all women and when men were employed they never wore livery. When the supper was served at dances, there was no regular supper-room—but the women and girls sat down all over the house, anywhere, everywhere, on the steps and in the passages, with a napkin on their knees, while their partners waited on them with the oysters and chicken salad, which almost invariably formed the banquet.

It was a most happy little coterie; few were very rich and all was on a comparatively small scale; indeed, the arrangements might be called provincial. There was not much splendor, nor was there great comfort, either. Still, I look back to it with great pleasure and with some regret, when I recollect the amiable, hospitable and innocent group of young people who formed the gay society of New York fourteen years ago.

In so young and so growing a country as the United States ten years count for thirty in Europe. Nevertheless, I was not prepared for the extraordinary and stupendous change which I found had come over New York when I returned there early in the present year. In the matter of pavements, street repairs, clearage of snow, and cabs, New York had made no progress that I could see, unless it were "*en rêculant*," but the moment we left the side streets and

came to the part of New York where I had lived during my last stay I was amazed. A vista of palaces and fine churches extended for a mile and a quarter to Central Park, which on our last visit was a spot surrounded by a desert. The hotel where apartments had been taken for us was a magnificent building ten stories high, a perfect blaze of electric light, marble, gilding and carving, and all really in excellent taste. The crowds of well-dressed people, the number of restaurants on the ground floor, and the gilt cages of the elevators flying up and down like lightning, quite took my breath away. And when I had been spirited up in a minute to the fifth floor, where there awaited us a splendid suite of rooms, upholstered in silk and furnished with every convenience it was possible to imagine, and in the most luxurious style, I felt in a dream. It was not, however, till the next day that the surprises really began, and they continued during the fortnight we remained in New York. Those houses of which I saw the interiors were one and all remarkable in some way or other. It seemed as if all the artistic treasures of Europe (I do not, of course, allude to pictures or statues) had taken wings and flown to New York. In one house a priceless collection of china; in another a similar one of books, while several houses were decorated with the entire fittings of old French chateaux and hotels. I saw two splendid unique cut mantel pieces, and everywhere beautiful pieces of French furniture of the Louis XIV. and Louis XV. period. In most cases the whole decorations were so beautifully dove-tailed and arranged that it was difficult not to believe they had always been in the places they now occupied.

The entertainments I went to were, as before, on a most lavish and generous scale, accompanied by a generous magnificence which was equally striking whether the party were a large or a small one. The cooking in every house I went to, and, I may add, in every restaurant, was simply perfect.

The beauty of the women and the beauty and good taste of their dress were also very apparent. It was not that one or two were so remarkably handsome, but the fact that they were all so generally good-looking and well-dressed made them different from any people I had seen before. But what I consider the greatest change of all, and the one fraught with the greatest importance to America and her future, is the radical change in the customs, habits, and, I may say, constitutions of the women and children

in New York in the last fifteen years. All the lovely girls I had known here when I was last in New York were now lovely women. Instead of American women being old at thirty they are now young at forty—they retain health and spirits and good looks, take plenty of exercise, and are constantly in the open air. The race of petted, delicate children, sitting up late and crammed with sweets and ice cream, has given place to troops of rosy boys and girls, who go to bed early, have wholesome meals and look as healthy and bright as the best of our English children at home.

There was one thing, however, I found had not changed in America, and that was the extraordinary kindness and hospitality with which strangers are received. I also found the dances as gay and pleasant as ever, though they are now principally given in private houses and with all the luxury and detail of a London or Paris ball. Everybody, old and young, seemed to be as fond of dancing as ever, and as pleased to take part in a well-led cotillon.

There are doubtless other interesting topics, both about New York itself and other parts of America, by entering on which the extraordinary progress made by this great people in the last fourteen years could, perhaps, be more forcibly shown. Still as the manners, habits, customs, and morals of the wealthier and more powerful classes have always had very great influence on the lower sections of the community in every period of the history of the world, it cannot be amiss for the student of human nature to notice each radical change in them; such changes having always a great and momentous effect on the progress of civilization.

JESSICA SYKES.

FAULTS IN OUR CONSULAR SERVICE.

BY THE HON. ROBERT ADAMS, JR., RECENTLY U. S. MINISTER TO BRAZIL.

THAT Americans are essentially a careful and progressive people is especially evidenced among our business men. The care with which they select their assistants and the promotion that usually follows efficient and faithful service show a keen appreciation of their self interest. But when they turn to political affairs, they apply an entirely different code of ethics to their treatment of the public business. Nowhere is this illustrated in a greater degree than in the consular service of the United States Government. The method by which the men are chosen for the positions, necessarily brings forth poor candidates, while the short tenure of office, which is generally limited to the presidential term, almost certainly so if a change of party takes place, and the meagre salaries paid—in some posts hardly sufficient to support life in a respectable manner—deters competent men from entering the service. It should also be remembered that there is no promotion for efficient service; that a consul cannot hope for a change of climate from a trying to a more healthy and genial one, after a given period of service, and that there is always the prospect of returning to the United States broken down in health, unfitted to resume private business, and without prospect of further employment at the hands of the Government.

Change of party causes little or no improvement in the *personnel* of the service. The evil lies in the system and not in partisan politics. In this case the degrading and demoralizing doctrine "To the victors belong the spoils" is really not so bad as the attendant and inveterate practice of distributing the spoils for supposed partisan services and according to supposed claims of

persons and localities with little or no regard to the qualifications of the appointees. Consuls are appointed to reside abroad for the purpose of protecting, facilitating and extending commerce between the countries which appoint them and the countries whither they are sent. Their functions, however, are not limited to commercial transactions. They stand as the protectors and advisers of their countrymen present in foreign lands ; they act as judges, notaries and administrators of intestates and of all property of such as have no legal representative ; they have to prevent frauds on the revenue, to notice infractions of treaty stipulations relating to trade, to advise their Government of new laws or regulations within their districts, to preserve the discipline of the commercial marine, to guard seamen from oppression, and they are expected to aid the destitute, for which purpose no funds are available except their meagre salary.

Consuls are also required to prepare from time to time reports upon matters affecting commercial, industrial, financial and agricultural interests, regarding labor, rate of wages, hours of work, and the condition of working people. In preparing these reports they are to bear in mind that the principal purpose to be served is the extension and encouragement of American industry at home and of her commerce abroad. Certainly these are duties sufficiently arduous and numerous to require for their faithful performance all the intelligence, honor, and patriotism of the best citizens of the Republic.

The United States has now reached a point in its development where it raises more cereals than it consumes, produces more goods than the people can wear, and more manufactured articles than the country needs. The necessity for foreign markets is pressing home to the people. Men may differ as to the method of securing these, whether under the open principle of Free Trade or the more conservative doctrine of Protection with Reciprocity, but all must agree that an intelligent extension of our commerce can only be effected through reliable information furnished by experienced observers. All people and every section of our country have an almost equal interest at stake, whether it be the farmer of the West seeking to learn the state of the flour market at Rio de Janeiro, the merchant in the East desirous of obtaining reports of the rubber yield at Para or of coffee at Santos, or the manufacturer of locomotives or of agricultural implements as to

the needs for their productions in Brazil or Argentine. These are but illustrations which could be amplified in every section of our own land and which reach to every country on the globe. That the present system does not furnish such information was evidenced by the acknowledged embarrassment of our State Department in negotiating the recent reciprocal treaties. So great was the *desideratum* that a new bureau was established to gather the missing data, special agents often being sent to obtain the desired information.

The importance of our consular service being recognized as well as the useful part it may be made to play in the hoped-for extension of the foreign trade, the question naturally arises: "How can it be improved?" Two great obstacles appear at the first step in that direction; first the ignorance of the majority of the people of the importance of the consular service as affecting their individual interests, and secondly the "spoils system" that has engrafted itself on our political parties. Let the people understand this question and they will soon insist that Civil Service rules shall be applied to this branch of the Government as they have been to the Post-office and other departments.

The Department of State prides itself upon the fact that below the Assistant Secretary no removals are made except for cause. Why could not this doctrine be extended to the consular service which is under its supervision? What a change would come over our consuls if they should be encouraged to hope for permanence in office, and have removed from their contemplation at every turn of the political tide the degrading spectacle of a basket full of bloody heads rushing at them for their own. Such conditions must either make many men cowards and time-servers or make them stolidly indifferent to the discharge of their duties. What incitement has a man so situated to make a close study of the politics, manners, alliances and commercial necessities of the people among whom he lives, and for making clear and compact statements of these in his reports to his government, for as soon as acquired he may be removed and the information be of no value to him.

Our consuls should be trained for their positions, and pass an examination on such subjects as the laws regulating shipping, the commercial treaties existing between their own and other countries, the laws relating to intestates, on the consular regu-

lations of the United States, and on such other subjects as relate to their duties. They should also be required to have a practical knowledge of French or of the language of the country to which they are to be sent. It will be demanded: "Where will such a specially educated class come from?" Once it is understood that the service is a permanent one, young men will prepare for it the same as they do for other professions, and in sufficient numbers to arouse competition. That this is not a matter of conjecture was fully established by the experience in Great Britain, when the examination for the civil service was thrown open to all, the number of applicants having increased the first year from five to fifteen thousand, and the character and ability of the applicants having proved as high as, if not better than, that of the selected applicants had been before.

To insure this, however, the salaries must be raised. How can a man be expected to live at Para, in Brazil, under an equatorial sun, exposed to malarial and yellow fevers, and deprived almost entirely of all social intercourse, for $1,500 a year? or, even worse, at Santos, where the town was decimated by yellow fever during the past year, the victims including the United States vice-consul? Yet the importance of the first position to our country can best be stated by the value of the exports to the United States, which amount annually to $7,000,000; while the annual export of coffee alone from the second port to our country is $25,000,000. These cases could be amplified, but they are sufficient to illustrate the present state of affairs.

The false economy of the present system is displayed in the small amount of work performed by the incumbents of our consular posts. They work in proportion to their meagre salaries; no inducement of promotion or reward is held out for a good report. This false economy is further shown in the maintenance of so many unnecessary little posts in Canada and Europe. England has not half the number of consuls in all the United States that we have in the British Isles. These minor posts should be abolished and for the same money that we now spend we might have a well-paid and efficient consular corps.

Nowhere is the adage "the best is the cheapest" more forcibly illustrated than in the consular service. Had it been composed of the proper material no necessity could have arisen for the establishment of the South American Bureau; or, of sending

special commissioners to the foreign governments to make arrangements for their exhibits at the Columbian Exposition. With an experienced diplomatic corps and with consuls of long residence, speaking the language of the country in which they were stationed, our country would have been spared this great expense.

The consular service should also be made more homogeneous. As at present constituted there is no general supervision over the different consulates in the several countries. They should all be made subservient to the consul-general, or even better, as in the English service, to the Minister accredited to the country in which they are located. As it is some consuls report to the Legation, some to the consul-general, and others direct to the Department of State. This custom arose partly out of the desire to procure quicker mail facilities, but in many instances the postal service has been improved lately, and the cable and telegraph can be used for emergencies. The consuls-general could be dispensed with, or if retained should pay annual visits to the different posts in their districts, a duty at present only permitted in some countries once a year, and by special permission on application to the Department. A novel feature might be substituted to increase the efficiency of the consular service in the institution of several superintendents, whose duty it would be to visit the various consulates and inform the Department in relation to their true state, such as the proper location of the office, the state of the records, the correctness of accounts, as well as to ferret out abuses and inquire into any charge of misconduct, all of which can only be done by personal inspection. Owing to their remoteness, consuls are less under the eye of the appointing power and the espionage of the public press than any class of public officials.

The second division of our service, known as "Class C," composed of consuls who receive a small salary, but who are allowed to engage in private business, should be eliminated. One of the Secretaries of State in his report said "in the greater number of cases the place is sought for chiefly for the advantages and the influence it will give to extend the commercial affairs of the officer." How can such dual interests be attended to with impartial service? The official duties must often conflict with personal gain, and the routine of the office is sure to suffer under pressure of private affairs. The temptation will exist to with-

hold in their reports commercial or other information detrimental to their own business, and, in consequence, those at home suffer whose very interests the consuls are supposed to represent. How can it be expected that a merchant will attend to instructions having a direct tendency to injure the business which he is conducting?

It is a sad truth that the respect in which the people of our country hold their public servants has been falling off during the last thirty years. How can it be otherwise when it is recognized that places in the public service are obtained by patronage and favoritism? How different it would be were it recognized that a consular appointment became the reward of personal merit and that the official position was itself evidence of good reputation and capacity proved in open competition. Our consular service should be made to rank socially with our army and navy. A pride would then attach to its membership.

The practice of sending mere influential partisans to even the humblest offices in foreign ports has ceased on the part of every European government. The United States stands alone in continuing the unwise old practice. The older nations have aroused themselves for the international war of races and states for the commerce of the world, and as personal rights and interests become more important and sacred the different political communities of the world become more convinced of the necessity of having competent representatives to foster and to protect them.

The United States, however, seems indifferent to the improvement of her consular service, and is apparently unwilling even to follow in the footsteps of her sister nations, but the present effort to extend our foreign trade will be terribly hampered, if not made altogether futile, unless a companion movement is made to improve our consular service.

ROBERT ADAMS, JR.

AFTER DEATH—WHAT?

BY THE REV. CHARLES F. DOLE.

LET me first tell why I believe in a future life. I am well aware of the difficulties on the physical side. But I am impressed everywhere with the fact that the invisible things—forces, laws, thoughts, ideas, love—are transcendently more important than the mere changing phenomena that we see. Even in the physical world it is "the unseen things that are eternal." Moreover, our minds require a purpose for the universe as truly as they compel us to look for order and unity in it. The idea of moral order, with Beneficence at the heart of things, alone satisfies this demand of the mind for an adequate purpose. But if death ended all what adequate purpose could there be? Or what would the beautiful order be good for, if it worked out nothing but death?

We observe again that for the normal, healthy life of man, for mental sanity and needful moral impulse, the element of hope is an essential factor. It is at least reasonable, since the hope of immortality makes for completeness of life, that it stands for reality. As a rule, man *at his best*, that is, in those times when he most thoroughly realizes the human ideal, is most impressed with the conviction that life and not death is his destiny.

The contemplation of the fullest and most noble lives tends to produce this impression. Whatever may be one's thought about Jesus, it is hardly rational to suppose that such a spirit should be snuffed out like a candle by death. In fact it is incredible, in a world where no atom is lost and where no force is extinguished but merely changed from one form to another, that the lives of good men should utterly perish and ultimately leave nothing in the universe to represent them except the burnt-out planet, the scene of the tragedy of their vain struggles and aspirations.

The truth is that this is a universe full of wonderful possibilities. Even in this life the things that happen to us, if they were predicted beforehand, would often be beyond our power to believe. For various reasons, therefore, I am urged by the stress of all my highest knowledge and experience at the very least to leave wide open the sky-room of hope.

But how can another life be? This is the difficulty that naturally perplexes us. For even if it were true, that certain persons had been raised from the dead, they have not made the nature of the other life any clearer. I do not, however, find this to be a serious difficulty. In the first place I do not want to know definitely about the future life, any more than I want to be told in advance what will happen next year. The present life is about as much as I can attend to without discounting the future. I wish to preserve the element of surprise.

Moreover, if the other life is in any way different from this life; if, for example, it does not consist in learning arithmetic, raising corn, or making shoes; if there is a large variety in store, how can we have a description of that for which we do not possess the language? It is as though one were to try to tell an Esquimaux about the life in Southern California. The chance is that the incredulous Esquimaux would prefer to stay in Greenland. Unless the future, then, is a dull and monotonous repetition of this life, it may be reverently doubted whether the Almighty could make us understand how that life could be; for, surely, this life itself, from birth onward, is a succession of mysteries, and no man who passes through it could have been told in advance how these things could be.

It seems evident that much that characterizes life might disappear in a future life as completely as the material body. Our mental furniture is largely fitted to the present environment. Our memory consists mostly of things and names. The sweeping away of the English language would not indeed destroy personality, but it would not leave much furniture in our minds. But what reason have we to think that we should want the English language in a future life, or that a man who had learned nothing except to speculate in stocks, would be any more able to carry his earth knowledge along with him than to carry his money? Or, suppose that a man had been a great scientist, does anyone imagine that he would have use for his knowledge of fossils or bacteria? Paul seems to give a hint of these things when he writes "whether there be knowledge, it shall be done away."

Let us take the highest type of man and see what there is left after you remove the present environment and the body of knowledge which merely fits this environment. It is like asking what the man would have if you set him down as a stranger

in India or China. There are certain mental, moral, and spiritual qualities that would serve such a man wherever he might be. Thus his knowledge of the mathematical relations, his skill and insight into principles, his alertness and habits of mind, his sense of justice, his courtesy and humanity, his good temper, his love and faith, would hold good in India as in America. These qualities would at once make him at home with strange men and a new environment. These qualities would secure friends for him, wherever human beings were. By virtue of such qualities he would have what we may call the *citizenship of the world.*

Science has been teaching us suggestive lessons about the structure of the universe. It is the same stuff that is aflame in Sirius, as in the sun or in the heart of the earth. Gravitation and other laws seem to be universal. One who knows these laws as they work here may know them to the bounds of space. We catch a similar conception of the moral laws of the world. He who has a pure heart, who abides by principle, who has learned to do justly and to love mercy would be at home anywhere in God's universe. The moral and spiritual qualities of which we have spoken seem to give him the *citizenship of the universe.*

It is idle to ask in detail what such an one would do in another life. It is wearisome to be told, as some say, that he will continue to trade or to build railroads. But we can surmise that he would know how to use, control and enjoy the divine forces, that he would there, as here, rejoice to obey the universal laws, that he would find there, as here, order and beauty, that his highest satisfaction would be found there, as here, in love. We may surmise, since the universe is still in process of evolving, since many beings go out of this life with nothing more than the undeveloped germ of a higher nature, and the strong, therefore, continually must live by the side of the weak, that there, as here, he would live the life of a helper and friend.

There is a truth in what the Buddhists call the doctrine of Nirvana. In the highest reaches of the personality, when one is filled with a great and pure love, or when in consecration to duty the will is one with the Good Will, there is the least consciousness of self. In such moments the human spirit seems to transcend time and space and finite limitations. If this experience of "union with God" is the best which life here offers, it would appear to be the earnest of the eternal life. There is

said to be a beautiful teaching of the Japanese Buddhism, much like the story of Christ, that to those who have won the right to enter into the state of innermost peace, is given the choice of descending again into the struggle of life for the sake of their needy brethren. The law of their being always requires them to choose the path of service. Thus it seems to be true, as long as finite development lasts, that rhythm, contrast, and struggle will continue.

I have raised a question about the permanence of the larger part of the contents of the personal memory. Much that the memory carries, as for example, the eccentricities of English spelling, so far from being needful to the maintenance of the personality, is an incumbrance to the activity of the mind. We need not be surprised, however, if we should discover that there is a world-memory. I mean that in this marvellous universe, where no force is lost and no atom wears out, it is likely that every fact records itself and can be recovered with the right key. Every secret may be brought to the light.

I am aware that there are those who would make the pleasure of heaven to consist chiefly in retrospect. This suited a heaven where there was nothing to do but to sit on thrones. The error was in making life to be some other state from the present. While here we think of life as to be had in heaven; when we arrive there it seems that life will consist in looking back to what we did on earth! The truth is, that the conditions of life are universal. God is present here; heaven may be had here. There would be little ground for believing that God is in a future life, unless we have been impressed with his reality here.

The question is often asked: "What will become of the higher animals, since they, too, have mind and moral affections?" The more startling question is asked: "What will become of beastly savages?" or, "Where do all the children go who die in infancy?" It cannot be thought that all these have acquired citizenship in the universe. There has scarcely been developed in them a personality, or anything by which they would know themselves after their earthly environment was taken away. What clue of any sort do they carry wherewith to maintain their identity? Or what is there in them worth saving, more than so much mind-stuff or soul-stuff? We may believe that nothing precious will be lost; we may hope, too, if any being, a dog or a horse, possesses

the infinite qualities which make true personality and confer the citizenship of the universe, that somewhere this germ of higher life will have development. But surely the less development here, the more slender must be any bond of identity to connect another life with this.

It is often asked: "Shall we know our friends?" This would seem to depend on what the basis of friendship has been. The lower kind of love involved in selfishness, the friendship that arises out of accidental juxtaposition, can hardly be conceived to hold after the circumstances that made it have disappeared. But there is a kind of love that grows out of the higher nature, another name of which is unselfishness. This love, we think, will know its own "on any sea or shore." All noble souls, who have true love will instinctively know each other. Socrates' dream will come true, that he would recognize the sages to whose order he belonged. In other words, the only ties that can endure death must be real ones. Artificial ties may be expected to snap.

Finally, I would insist that the view of the future life that I have sketched is altogether ethical, as it ought to be. It would have little weight or interest for the immoral. But in a moral universe the anticipation of a future life justly forebodes toil and trouble for the immoral. It is wholesome for the sensualist, the egotist, and the avaricious to consider how little spiritual capital they are laying up with which to enter a future existence. It is wholesome to see that selfishness, by the working of the eternal laws, must debar anyone from "the citizenship of the universe." It is wholesome to reflect, if one wishes to recognize friends in the other life, that friendship must be founded on goodness. The New Testament has the universal teaching, namely, that "whosoever loveth is born of God and knoweth God." He that loveth may, alone, be without fear of death.

The evidence that persuades us of the future life is not outward and physical, but moral and spiritual. If there is in us a nature that partakes of the infinite and is worth saving out of mortal changes, the facts and experiences of this better nature, as it develops, must always be the best witness to its existence, and the prophecy of its immortality.

CHARLES F. DOLE.

THE NEGRO AS A MECHANIC.

BY THE HON. ROBERT LOWRY, EX-GOVERNOR OF MISSISSIPPI.

CAN the negro be trained as a mechanic, or is he by nature adapted to other work than that of an unskilled laborer? The question may confidently be answered in the affirmative. While this answer cannot be successfully controverted, and while it may have a material bearing on the prosperity of the Southern States, yet it involves grave questions, the successful solution of which would tend to a better understanding of the two sections of this great nation. The negro was held in bondage in all the colonies save one, before the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and whether or not he was the prime cause of the greatest war of modern times, it is unquestionably true that he regards his liberation as the result of that struggle.

Prior to the war there were a large number of negro mechanics in the Southern States; many of them were expert blacksmiths, wheelwrights, wagon-makers, brick-masons, carpenters, plasterers, painters, and shoemakers. They became masters of their respective trades by reason of sufficiently long service under the control and direction of expert white mechanics. During the existence of slavery the contract for qualifying the negro as a mechanic was made between his owner and the master workman.

Now the negro being, in his own words, a "freed man," will not consent to restraints. He cannot divest himself of the idea that apprenticeship in its most modified form is a species of slavery for a term of years. He may be assured of the relation of master and apprentice as it exists in almost every civilized country; still he is slow to embrace it. He appreciates the advantages of superior skill, yet his teachings of liberty are to his mind inconsistent with the exercise of absolute and continued authority over him.

Many persons in Mississippi and Louisiana remember a firm extensively engaged as contractors and builders of bridges and houses before the war, who owned their entire force of negro mechanics. These gentlemen were natives of Pennsylvania, but neither their education nor their early prejudices against the system of African slavery as it then existed in the Southern States of the Union were strong enough to prevent them from purchasing intelligent young negroes and teaching them to become expert mechanics. Some of these negroes became excellent carpenters, others were trained to be brick-masons and plasterers, and a few of them were taught to be expert iron-workers. This firm built a large number of bridges which spanned various streams in Mississippi, and hundreds of spacious residences and public buildings.

It has never been an unusual sight to see white and negro mechanics working in the same shop or on the same building in any of the Southern States. In the days of slavery it never caused the slightest friction for the two races to be engaged in work together. There never was, and there is not to-day, in any portion of the great and growing South, the slightest objection on the part of the white people to the employment of negro mechanics who are at all capable of performing what is required of them. On the contrary, the men of the South, knowing the good qualities and the docility of the negroes, never withhold employment from them unless it be on large contracts to which the negro mechanics are financially unequal.

Since the war the young negro men have been allured by schemers, white and black alike, into politics, which they have come to believe is the chief end of existence. It is natural for the negro to be a subject of anxious solicitude on the part of those who contributed to his emancipation, as well as those who formerly owned him, and among whom he now lives and will continue to live. In this connection I am constrained to believe that a failure on the part of each section to properly appreciate the aims and objects of the other creates differences and contentions in relation to the condition, needs and welfare of the negro.

With advanced thought and unequalled civilization it is doubtful whether American leadership reaches that high standard erected a half century ago by the great commoner of Kentucky.

In the words of one who pronounced a eulogy on the life and services of Mr. Clay, which deserves a place among the best productions in the English language, appears the following:

"There was nothing sectional in his policy. His broad and comprehensive genius held in its vision the interests of the whole nation, and his big American heart throbbed for it all. He was intensely American in all his thoughts and all his feelings. To cherish the interests and the glory and to build up the power of his country, and his whole country, was the aim of all his policy and the passion of his life. He knew perfectly the relation which each part of the country bore to the other, and he understood profoundly the character, genius and wants of the American people."

Such leadership to-day, from whatever quarter, divested as it would be of fanaticism and mistaken philanthropy, would be a blessing to this great country.

The recent enfranchisement of the negroes leads them to look with deep-rooted aversion and hostility to entering into an indenture as an apprentice for two or more years, even for the acquirement of proficiency as a first-rate mechanic. They have an idea that they are abridging their own liberty, as indeed they do during the term of their indenture, forgetting that, while thus restricting their freedom of action for a few years, they are acquiring a familiarity with a mechanical trade which may be, and often is, of priceless value. There is but little difficulty in training an intelligent negro to be a mechanic. In all the cities and towns in the South he is to be found engaged in such employment, and his proficiency is only retarded by impediments and obstructions which, through the influence of others, he makes for himself. If the negro without education or mental training could make a reasonably good mechanic, it follows that education would largely increase his skill as a workman.

The people of Mississippi, and, so far as I am advised, of all the Gulf States, have assumed the obligation of affording the children of both races and sexes the most ample facilities for obtaining a common-school education free of charge. In addition to the revenue raised in Mississippi for the purpose mentioned, the State has for years contributed, and is now contributing, in part to the support of an institution for colored boys and girls, in which an industrial superintendent has been added to the corps of instructors. The industrial department of this institution embraces the making of wagons, carpenter work, blacksmith and tin shops, besides other industries, all of which are success-

fully conducted by the students, under the supervision of the industrial teacher.

The negro is an intensely imitative and excitable creature. When under the influence of excitement he is subject to the greatest excesses. Free from excitement, his capacity for labor, under proper control, is and can be profitably utilized.

The American who is reasonably informed of his country's history will not fail to remember that party spirit was regarded by Washington as the bane of our institutions ; and this becomes doubly intensified by sectional animosities in which the negro, through others, has come to be an important factor. The imitative quality in negroes of both sexes is constantly observed in every-day life in the South ; not only is it observable in the negro man, but it is equally marked in the more intelligent colored woman. She adopts with facility the styles and fashions of the leading ladies of society. Not only so, but some colored women become expert mantua-makers, and cut, fit, and make expensive gowns for white ladies of wealth.

Another reason why the negroes of the South are averse to being taught mechanical trades is to be found in what they understand to be the hostility of the white mechanics of the North against the negro mechanic. They assert as their information, and insist that it is true, that young negroes are not allowed to learn a mechanical trade in any city or town in the North or West. As white mechanics are nomadic in their habits and wander from State to State, city to city, and town to town, so the negro of any age or sex is more of a nomad than his pale-faced brother ; yet his fixed opinion seems to be that in the pursuit of his trade he cannot venture beyond the confines of his own State or the neighboring Southern States with any certainty of remunerative employment based upon proficiency. Therefore, objecting to the restraints imposed in learning a trade at home, alleging that it borders upon a species of slavery, and assuming that because of the color of his skin he would be debarred from an even chance as a "bread-winner" among white mechanics of the North, he floats on the sluggish tide of indolence and idleness, with not much care of what a day may bring forth.

That the more intelligent negro has abundant capacity to become a reasonably good mechanic there can be no question ; but his crude ideas of freedom, his want of appreciation of citizen-

ship, the cheap diet upon which he subsists, the genial climate that requires but a humble shelter, and the heretofore annual excitement attending political elections, all tend to divert his mind from any fixed object or occupation. He will not become proficient in the mechanical field, even with the rudiments of education, until he can divest himself of false traditions and prejudices pertaining to his future exemption from slavery, and thoroughly understands that it requires time and close service to master the trade of the mechanic. The great mass of negroes are engaged in agriculture, and these are more contented than those who follow other pursuits; but all need protection from the constant political strife to which they have been subjected.

The constitution of Mississippi has fixed the tenure of State and county offices at four years, and from and after 1895 elections other than Congressional will recur only every fourth year. This change in the fundamental law, it is believed, will add to the peace and quietude of the State. It is difficult to understand by any process of reasoning why sectional animosities caused by slavery should be kept alive a quarter of a century after the institution had been abolished. True it is that the white and black races are separated by a gulf that cannot be spanned; but the fair inference of the civilized world was that broad statesmanship would so adjust the relations between the races as to develop the greatest amount of good in the former slave, and, if possible, lead him to a higher plane of civilization. All should generously unite in contributing to his mental elevation and moral training, and thus fit him for greater efficiency in agricultural pursuits, and afford those who seek skilled labor an opportunity of entering that field.

Although slavery existed prior to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and at that time and for many years thereafter was considered an unavoidable evil, yet the institution, coupled with other causes, cost the Government hundreds of thousands of valuable lives and billions of money. The negro was not only guiltless as to the differences that precipitated the war, but was not a participant to any appreciable extent. He remained loyal to his owner during the protracted struggle. Liberated in poverty and ignorance, he appealed to all parties and all fair-minded men for protection against improper manipulations, and for direction in the channels of industry to which he is adapted.

It should be understood that, in dealing with great questions affecting directly or remotely the people of the whole country, material differences exist between statesmen of high rank, and in the submission of policies for adoption the masses who are less versed in governmental matters, but who bear the burdens, pass upon and determine the issues.

It is gratefully understood, too, that philanthropists like Mr. Peabody, Mr. Corcoran, Mr. Slater, and others, whose memories are cherished by the American people and whose great hearts embraced mankind, devoted the accumulations of a lifetime to charitable and benevolent purposes; but it is difficult to comprehend why, in a government of the largest liberty under the sun, there should be such great diversity of views in reference to the training and civilization of a race of people known to be vastly inferior either to the Anglo-Saxon or Latin race. A quarter of a century has passed since the freedom of the negro was proclaimed; yet American statesmanship seems not to have been equal to the solution of the great problem of his mental, moral, and physical elevation.

Another obstacle that suggests itself to converting colored youths into skilled workmen lies in the hostility of the various mechanical trades to allowing more than an infinitesimal percentage of apprentices, even of the white race. This mistaken policy has its growth in the perpetual fear of home competition, while the doors are left wide open to an innumerable swarm of skilled workmen from other lands.

With the removal of the obstacles to which reference has already been made, there can be no question that the more intelligent young negroes in the Southern States can readily acquire in the various mechanical trades the skill necessary to make them expert workmen, as carpenters, cabinet-makers, blacksmiths, shoemakers, tailors, painters, tinners, paper-hangers, upholsterers and plasterers. The removal of these obstacles, and the accomplishment of the purpose aimed at will undeniably redound to the benefit of both races, and will certainly elevate the negro, and promote his happiness, prosperity, and self-respect in a very remarkable degree.

ROBERT LOWRY.

MIDDLE-CLASS LIFE IN FRANCE.

BY THE MARQUISE DE SAN CARLOS.

WHAT does the word *bourgeois* mean? Mistrusting my own judgment, I applied to a distinguished member of the French Institute and one of the most venerable representatives of the old régime, in order to learn his opinion on the subject. But he launched forth into so long and laborious a history of the Bourgeois or Commoner of the middle ages, and city charts and townsfolk generally, in comparison with the nobility and the *tiers état*, that, losing all patience, I risked an interruption and told him I had learned all that at school years ago, and that what I wanted to know just now was simply the modern signification attached to the word *bourgeois*.

Looking quite as startled at my interruption as he was perplexed at my question, the kind old gentleman gave a deep sigh, and answered: "Madame, what a *bourgeois* means to-day I cannot tell. Now that everybody may become a gentleman, as the English say, we have no more nobles, no more *bourgeois*, no more *tiers état*.

But I knew that bourgeois still meant something in France, for I remember a certain little speech made at one of Madame Adam's receptions. A charming young artist was excusing herself for singing with a cold, when our hostess said in her genial way: "No need of excuses, my dear; we all understand perfectly the disadvantages under which you labor and appreciate only the more the art you display: *il n'y a pas de bourgeois parmi nous.*"

Ah! then the bourgeois exists, and in that little coterie of art and science not belonging to the nobility the bourgeois is looked down upon as well as by the latter.

While musing one day over these strange contradictions I chanced to notice a man in a blouse daubing the walls of my

vestibule, and, addressing him as a representative of the lower classes, I called out : "My friend, *qu'est ce qu'un bourgeois?*" With a scowl of hatred he muttered : "*Un rentier pardi!*"

Here, then, lay the clue. Yes, *bourgeois* is the man who has ceased to work, who lives on his hard-earned income. And the *bourgeosie* is that immense body of the French nation which represents *l'epargne*, or, in other words, capitalized savings. The *bourgeois* is the man who has made his money cent by cent during the first three-quarters of his life, and who spends it in pretty much the same proportion during the last remaining quarter. As long as he works he is not a *bourgeois*. But as soon as he retires from business and lives on his income, however small it may be, he becomes *Monsieur Bourgeois*.

To reach this goal has been his one ambition through a lifetime of want and labor, and I fancy Heaven itself would appear an almost superfluous recompense to those who have actually attained this stage of human felicity. The *bourgeois* thinks of nothing, aspires to nothing, but to make money, not in a gay, off-hand, haphazard way, but ever cautiously, calculating over a centime or silently grasping at a penny. And the *bourgeois* in this case means the woman as well as the man, the wife as well as the husband, for both work on untiringly, attached by the same bonds to the yoke of labor.

I remember once accompanying a friend to a Paris confectioner's. She was a wealthy American who spent money lavishly. On this particular occasion she paid an unusually large bill, and while waiting for the change ate a tempting "fondant." We were leaving the shop when she suddenly remembered it, and, turning to the saleswoman, with one of her beaming smiles, she said : "I have eaten one of your pretty bonbons ; what do I owe you ?"

"Two cents," answered the woman, unhesitatingly.

Had not those ten centimes been discounted already by the proprietor ? No Frenchman throws away two sous on a client unwittingly ; no more than a French client would think of eating two sous' worth of candy without paying for it. The *bourgeois* knows too well what it costs to make two sous in an old country, and the rich man knows exactly the amount of pleasure he is entitled to expect from the same two sous.

While writing the above lines a reminiscence of South American life has come back so forcibly to me that, although somewhat

of a diversion, it may serve as a *repoussoir* to my Frascati experience.

Having spent three years in a half-civilized, half-outlandish place, where every morning a sunburnt "guagiro" brought me six earthen jugs of fresh milk, I sent for him one day to pay him his last month's earnings before sailing back to Europe, and bade him continue bringing half a jug daily for a few weeks longer to a servant remaining on the premises. I afterwards learned that the poor "guagiro" had stoutly refused the slightest remuneration for these last fifteen jugs, on the ground that we had paid him money enough during three years. Yet this man never expected to meet us again.

By this time the Parisian confectioner has, no doubt, shaken from off his sandals the flour of his thriving little pastry establishment, and now lives in some beautiful modern building near the "Arc de l'Etoile," whereas the sun-burnt "guagiro" will die far away in his palm-thatched hut, and his deathbed will be illumined only by the cold light of stars.

But, returning to our French *bourgeois*, from the day he leaves school we find him an apprentice to his father. He knows to a farthing what his parents gain and how they set about it, and while still a boy he draws in his neat and orderly little mind the commonplace castle in the air he desires to inhabit during his old age, and he will retire from business as soon as he has secured the means of realizing it, be it after twenty, thirty, or forty years of incessant labor. He not only overworks himself, as a rule, but he bears any amount of privations, until he has made just so much capital as is requisite to live upon after the manner of his choice. The owner of a small shop dreams of a brick cottage and a tiny garden; the inhabitant of the fifth story aspires to an apartment on the third floor, and he who li[illegible] au premier" wants a *hotel* of his own or a château in the country.

Many gay villages in the outskirts of Paris are inhabited by these happy little people. Thus at one place we have Monsieur and Madame Jacques, who are perfect types of the *petit bourgeois*, the *petit rentier*. Monsieur Jacques owned a brewery in Paris and worked there for thirty-seven years. His wife was a milliner and had a little establishment of her own. Monsieur Jacques is as fat and redolent as one of his own beer casks, while Madame Jacques has a wrinkled old face that reminds one of a faded lace bonnet.

Having reached the Elysian fields of *la Retraite*—retirement from business—they would both be perfectly happy were not Monsieur Jacques pursued by the idea that he might have sold the "Brasserie Normande" for a thousand francs more had he only held out a little longer. And if you want to know Madame Jacques's sore point, ask her who she is going to leave her pretty little brick cottage to, and you will see a tear trickle down the withered cheeks as she remembers the child she bore to the grave over twenty years ago.

The Jacques' neighbors are Monsieur and Madame Roy. In the first half of this century, Monsieur Roy was a barber's boy at Biarritz, and joined the army in the days when his mustache held its own as stiffly as that of Napoleon III., to which glorious advantage over his companions he probably owed his advancement. Now he lives on a government pension of seven hundred francs a year. These two good souls would likewise be perfectly happy had not the doctor kindly informed them that Monsieur Roy was in the last stage of heart disease, since when his wife repeats, to all who care to hear the tale, that as soon as her husband dies she will have only three hundred francs a year to live upon.

Their bedstead, which was a wedding present and has travelled after them all over France, literally fills one of their two tiny rooms, while the other is enlivened with gay colored curtains, a sideboard, a table, and some mahogany chairs. Indeed, this very small cot is a picture of cleanliness and order. A jug of flowers is always somewhere in sight, and a pile of illustrated papers lies on the table. A print of the Empress Eugénie and a cage full of canaries hang on the wall, while Madame Roy's sewing-machine keeps time to her husband's whistling, as he digs his bit of ground and plants small squares of potatoes and cabbages, with roses and heartsease for borders.

Still a little farther on we have the François establishment. It looks quite grand to the country people as they gaze into the small courtyard through the fancy iron gateway and wonder what grows in the miniature hothouse. I once called there on a sick-errand. There being no time to open the sitting-room, which is always kept locked up and in darkness, and is used only on such occasions as marriages, baptisms, and funerals, Madame François received me in the kitchen. This room is so small that it seemed

more suitable for a modern dollhouse than for grown-up people to live in. When I went upstairs to visit the invalid, I wondered if I would be able to turn around at the top and come down again without sticking fast between the wall and the banisters. But, oh, the cleanliness of every corner, the polish of every pot and jug, in that spic-and-span little house! Madame François triumphantly told me that it was so clean because she had no servants! No, she had not patience enough to see things badly done. And yet Madame François's daughter, who spends months at a time with her mother, is married to Messieurs X & Co.'s head clerk, a man who will be ere long a partner of the firm, and from thence to finding himself on a level with Mallets and Rothschilds there is but a step.

These comfortable French housewives, these "*ménagères de race,*" take such keen pleasure in doing things themselves that they rarely keep servants: a "*bonne à tout faire*"—a maid of all work—at best. As to their cooking—the *cuisine bourgeoise*—it is quite delicious, and forms the staple aristocrats live upon when nobody sees them. The specialty of this wholesome *cuisine* consists in its savory gravies: *gibelotte de lapin, ragout de mouton* and the like. The *bourgeois* has seldom more than one dish at a meal, but the absorption of gravy with pounds upon pounds of bread, with which they may be said to "lick the platter clean," seems to make up about as much solid nourishment and reconstituting substance as all the blood-streaming chops and beefsteaks that render English people so large-boned and raw-looking.

Indeed, the genuine French *bourgeois* does not know what dyspepsia means—pneumonias and typhoids are their swords of Damocles. They have calculated to a grain how much bread they can eat and to a drop how much wine they may drink. Hot rolls and fresh pastry are things never seen on their tables. A quarter of a pear is the most they take at a time: "pears lying cold on the stomach"—and even candies are never eaten out of hours. Over-eating seldom kills a Frenchman; whereas many succumb to the consequences of poor diet.

I know a dear little *bourgeoise* who has damask silk curtains and a piano in her drawing-room, whose daughter attends a fashionable boarding-school, but who eats beef on Sundays only, and fills up the rest of the week with sausages, tripe and sundry gravies. The girl is about fifteen, tall and slim, and looks as

though she were going into consumption. To expostulate with the mother about the child's fare is useless. "*On mange selon ses moyens,*" is her invariable answer on such occasions, and then she goes on to explain how she was brought up on far poorer food, and was never the worse for it. But the mother forgets that she grew up in the hardy, barefooted life of a mountain village, and that her daughter is living in the vitiated atmosphere of a city, spending her girlhood in the cruel stocks of school regulations. But nothing will convince my good little friend that a few chops would be better than silk curtains, and plenty of beefsteak more useful than learning the piano. Had they been richer they would have eaten more ; had they been poorer or more numerous they would have eaten still less.

Such petty details as the above may serve to give an insight into the general characteristics of the French *bourgeois*. For this reason also do I dwell particularly on the *petit bourgeois*, who is by far the more numerous, the big bourgeois resembling his counterpart all over the world. The *bourgeois* is the Frenchman with whom foreigners have the most to do and of whom they know the least. For has not the *bourgeois* been his tailor or his shoemaker before he has become his landlord or his neighbor ?

On the other hand, the bourgeois himself knows nothing at all about anything else in the world but his own *métier* ; he has never taken an interest in anything else, never read anything not absolutely necessary for his business transactions. He never travels ; but looks down upon travellers as a degenerate race of people who cannot keep still and enjoy life in their own country, and considers them at best eccentric specimens of humanity who have never been properly brought up or taught the right way of doing things and who are tolerated only because they are stupid enough to empty their heavy money-bags into empty French ones.

Generation after generation the *bourgeois* continues counting over the same centimes. His fare, his thoughts, his conversation, his daily walks, never change. His parents left him their tools with a corresponding supply of ideas and words and habits which it will never occur to him to alter. There is no spontaneousness about him ; never a pleasant surprise for the home circle ; never a present beyond a bouquet or a box of bonbons on stated anniversaries ; very little reading, if any ; balls and theatres are few and far between ; friendly gatherings of an evening or unceremonious

invitations to dinner are unheard-of expenses, resorted to only in honor of some great event or when there may be some grave family question to resolve.

If our future *bourgeois* be very poor he inhabits some dark corner in the back of his shop, or has a miniature flat near the skies; if he be in better circumstances, he occupies a third or fourth story, has mahogany furniture and rep curtains.

When a peasant passes rapidly through the ranks of the *bourgeoisie* and enters those of the nobility or the artistic world, he retains something of nature's lore as a birthright and the wide expanse of the fields and the glow of sunsets warm his soul with that heavenly gift, "*feu sacré.*" But when a *bourgeois* has continued making and selling the same buttons, or thimbles, or carriages, or jewels, in just the same shop and just the same street through six or seven generations, he grows into the personification of "*l'infiniment petit,*" and his grandchildren, married, perhaps, to dukes and countesses, often present curious cases of atavism.

Perhaps fortune designates our bourgeois to be the "one in a million," the lucky fellow who owns the "Bonheur des Dames" or the "Bouillon Durand." Then he plays "*le grand seigneur,*" buys a glorious old castle with a thousand acres of woodland, and since "*la sportomanie a transformé en ecurie le dernier salon,*" as Arsène Houssaye wittily remarks, he soon works his way into the aristocracy.

It is in our nineteenth-century stables that the nobleman and the bourgeois are both destined to disappear. Let us hope they may leave us in their stead—a gentleman.

LOLA DE SAN CARLOS.

THE FINANCIAL SITUATION.

I.—THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND THE CURRENCY.

BY THE HON. R. P. BLAND, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS AND MEASURES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FOR the first time for over thirty years the Democratic party finds itself in power in the executive and legislative departments of the Federal Government. The appalling demands upon the resources of the country to meet the enormous appropriations of money—nearly one-half of which is for pensions alone; an onerous system of taxation, and yet a depleted and bankrupted treasury; a makeshift and disjointed currency system satisfactory to no one; problems of imperialism presented in the questions of the annexation of foreign territory and peoples; all these pressing for consideration will require conservative statesmanship and patriotic endeavor to successfully meet and provide for them.

If the party is true to its principles as taught by its greatest leaders of the past, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, and Benton, the way to success is already pointed out. This article, however, will be confined to the question of currency.

What shall it be?

History is to repeat itself.

It is only necessary to call attention to the fact that nearly all the conflicts of the past between the Democratic party and its opponents on the currency question have taken the form of a contest between the advocates of hard money (so-called)—the coin of the constitution—gold and silver, and the advocates of National-Bank credit issues. The Democratic party for the most part was in power in this government from the beginning till 1860. The first Mint Act of 1792, in conformity with the constitution, founded our system upon the principles of the dual standard of gold and silver,

with free or unlimited coinage of both. This system the Democratic party never disturbed, but on the contrary kept open mints for the coinage of both metals.

In the memorable battles over these issues in the days of Democratic ascendency the fight was waged along the lines of opposition on the part of the Democrats to national banks and in favor of the free use of gold and silver. The fact that in these discussions and in the legislation that followed, especially in the days of Benton, there was a seeming preference on the part of the Democratic party for gold, must be explained in the light of the history of the time. There was no thought of issuing paper legal-tenders to take the place of bank paper. At that time it was not generally supposed that Congress had the power to issue paper legal-tenders for private debts.

National banks were objected to by Democrats on the broad principle that the system contemplated a monopoly by private corporations over the finances—the power to expand and contract the currency, the power over legislation and the politics of the country; that such powers tended to centralization and finally to the usurpation and domination of our currency system. In the light of the present and of recent history we can see how well founded these objections were.

In order to answer all the arguments in favor of bank currency as preferable to coin, resting upon the fact that paper was lighter to handle and more convenient in all respects than coin, the ratio was changed in 1834–37, so as to overvalue gold and thus attract it here to be used in competition with bank notes. This was done by diminishing the amount of gold in the dollar; no change was made as to the silver dollar—a gold dollar being by the ratio then and now established sixteen times lighter than the silver dollar, and hence the gold eagle, or ten-dollar piece, being one hundred and sixty times per weight lighter than ten dollars of silver. Gold could better answer the use in large transactions than silver, and in that was a more effectual competitor of paper issues than silver. For this reason only, a seeming preference was given to gold. But the Democratic party in all its history never demonetized either gold or silver. Free or unlimited coinage for both was always preserved. It does not seem that the methods of issuing paper on gold and silver coin dollar for dollar was thought of by Benton, Jackson and others

in their great contests against National Banks. Our present system obviates every objection to silver on the ground of inconvenience. In this short review it is seen that the Democratic party before the late civil war was opposed to a system of currency based on National banks. The following is a quotation from General Jackson's farewell address :

"In reviewing the conflicts which have taken place between the different interests in the United States, and the policy pursued since the adoption of our present form of government, we find nothing that has produced such a deep-seated evil as the course of legislation in relation to the currency.

. . . . . .

"When the charter for the Bank of the United States was obtained from Congress, it perfected the scheme of the paper system, and gave to its advocates the position they had struggled to obtain from the commencement of the Federal Government down to the present hour. The distresses and sufferings inflicted on the people by the banks are some of the fruits of that policy, which is continually striving to enlarge the authority of the Federal Government beyond the limits fixed for it by the Constitution. The powers enumerated in that instrument do not confer on Congress the right to establish such a corporation as the Bank of the United States.

"It behooves you, therefore, to be watchful in your States, as well as in the Federal Government. The power which the moneyed interest can exercise when concentrated under a single head, and with our present system of currency, was sufficiently demonstrated in the struggle made by the banks of the United States. . . . The time will soon come when it will again take the field against the United States, and succeed in perfecting and perpetuating its organization, by a charter from Congress.

"The paper-money system and its natural associates, monopoly and exclusive privileges, have already struck their roots deep in the soil, and it will require all your efforts to check its further growth and to eradicate the evil. . . . It will require steady and persevering exertions on your part to rid yourselves of the iniquities and mischiefs of the paper system and to check the spirit of monopoly and other abuses which have sprung up with it, and of which it is the main support. So many interests are united to resist all reforms on this subject that you must not hope the conflict will be a short one, nor success easy."

Continuing the record of the Democratic party upon the subject of National Banks we will give the record of the most significant votes upon this subject in both houses of Congress during the existence of the present system.

The Act of February 12, 1863. The bill providing for National-Bank currency was taken up in the Senate February 12, and voted upon and passed—ayes 23 ; including 22 Republicans and 1 Democrat : nays 21 ; 12 Democrats and 9 Republicans. In the House of Representatives this bill was voted on—ayes 78 ;

75 Republicans and 3 Democrats : nays 64 ; 42 Democrats and 22 Republicans. The supplement Act of June 3, 1864, was voted on in the House of Representatives April 18, 1864. The bill passed—ayes 80, all Republicans : nays 66 ; 65 Democrats, 1 Republican. The bill to re-charter these National Banks passed the House of Representatives May 19, 1882—ayes 125 ; 103 Republicans, 22 Democrats : nays 67 ; 57 Democrats, 2 Republicans, 8 Greenbackers. The bill passed the Senate amended on June 22—ayes 34 ; 26 Republicans, 8 Democrats : nays 13 ; 12 Democrats, 1 Republican. The Conference Report by which the bill passed and became a law was voted on in the House on July 10, 1882—ayes 110, 99 Republicans and 11 Democrats : nays 79 ; 69 Democrats, 2 Republicans, 8 Greenbackers.

This record shows conclusively that a large majority of the Democrats in the House and in the Senate have up to this period steadily opposed the national-banking system. It is to be presumed they will continue to do so. It must be plain that there can be no legislation by the Democratic party favorable to a currency supplied by any national-banking system. It is important, therefore, to review the recent record of the party looking to other methods of monetary supply. That the party has made a uniform record in favor of treasury notes in preference to National-Bank currency is shown also by many votes in the House and Senate.

In the House of Representatives, January 17, 1870, Mr. McNeely offered a resolution providing for the substitution of treasury notes or greenbacks for bank notes. On this question the yeas were 56 ; 53 Democrats and 3 Republicans : nays 114 ; 112 Republicans and 2 Democrats. Substantially the same question came up in the House of Representatives on motion of Mr. Randall, of Pennsylvania, July 14, 1870. On this vote the yeas were 51; 41 Democrats, 10 Republicans : nays 111 ; 105 Republicans, 6 Democrats.

Pending the consideration of the bill to re-charter the National Banks the author hereof moved amendments, the effect of which was to substitute treasury notes for bank notes, and to prohibit further issuance of bank notes. On this question the ayes were 71 ; 65 Democrats, 2 Republicans and 4 Independents : nays 138 ; 114 Republicans, 19 Democrats, 5 Greenbackers or Independents.*

*See House Journal, Forty-seventh Congress, pp. 1274-1281.

These citations are given to show that as choice between national bank and treasury notes the Democratic sentiment is overwhelming for the latter. On the question of restoring silver to our coinage the record is also significant in this connection. The Act for the free coinage of silver was passed in the House December 13, 1876—ayes 168; 124 Democrats, 44 Republicans: nays 53; 17 Democrats and 36 Republicans. There was no action on this bill in the Senate.

In the House, November 5, 1877, the following proceedings took place.* The Speaker announced as the regular order of business the motion of Mr. Bland, that the rules be suspended so as to enable him to introduce, and the House to pass, a bill of the following title, viz.: "A bill (H. R. 1,093) to authorize the coinage of a dollar of 412½ grains silver standard, and for other purposes," pending when the House adjourned on Monday last, and the question being put, it was decided in the affirmative (two-thirds voting in favor thereof)—yeas 164; 97 Democrats and 67 Republicans; nays 34; 10 Democrats and 24 Republicans. This bill was amended in the Senate by what is known as the Allison amendment, and thus passed the Senate—yeas 48; 25 Democrats, 23 Republicans: nays 21; 7 Democrats and 14 Republicans. This bill, as it passed the Senate, was agreed to by the House and was vetoed by President Hayes. It was passed over the veto in the House February 28, 1878—yeas 196; 122 Democrats, 74 Republicans: nays 73; 21 Democrats and 52 Republicans. It was also passed in the Senate on the same date, the veto notwithstanding—yeas 46; 25 Democrats and 21 Republicans: nays 19; 9 Democrats and 10 Republicans.

During the first session of the Fifty-first Congress, on motion to pass the Sherman bullion purchase bill, a motion was made by the writer to re-commit the bill with instructions to report back a bill for the free coinage of silver.† On this vote there were—yeas 116; 101 Democrats and 14 Republicans, 1 Wheeler: nays 140; 127 Republicans and 13 Democrats. The most recent vote on this question was at the first session of the Fifty-second Congress. In the House on March 17, 1892, on a motion to table the free-coinage bill the yeas were 148; 81 Democrats and 67 Republicans: nays 149; 130 Democrats, 11 Republicans, 8 People's

* Journal, first session (extra session) Forty-fifth Congress, pp. 143, 144.
† House Journal, first session Fifty-first Congress, pp. 714, 715.

Party. These records are produced to show the evident tendency of the Democratic party away from the plan of National-Bank currency to the currency supported by the precious metals, gold and silver.

Senator Benton, of Missouri, in his "Thirty Years in the United States Senate," stated what he then conceived to be the true Democratic theory of the currency question in the following terse and eloquent language (Vol. 1, page 187):

I am willing to see the charter expire, without providing any substitute for the present bank. I am willing to see the currency of the federal government left to the hard money mentioned and intended in the Constitution. I am willing to have a hard-money government, as that of France has been since the time of *assignats* and *mandats*. Every species of paper might be left to the State authorities, unrecognized by the federal government, and only touched by it for its own convenience when equivalent to gold and silver. Such a currency filled France with the precious metals, when England, with her overgrown bank, was a prey to all the evils of unconvertible paper.

It furnished money enough for the imperial government when the population of the empire was three times more numerous, and the expense of government twelve times greater, than the population and expenses of the United States; and when France possessed no mines of gold or silver, and was destitute of the exports which command the species of other countries. The United States possess gold mines now yielding half a million per annum, with every prospect of equalling those of Peru. But this is not the best dependence. We have what is superior to mines, namely, the exports which command the money of the world; that is to say, the food which sustains life, and the raw material which sustains manufactures.

Gold and silver is the best currency for a republic; it suits the men of middle property and the working people best; and if I was going to establish a workingman's party it should be on the basis of hard money; a hard money party against a paper party.

In the days of Benton and Jackson, as well as now, there were many influential Democrats whose sympathies were with the National-Bank party, and who were ready to discard the money of the people issued from the mints of the government and the notes of the Treasury, based on coin, for National-Bank paper isued by the hand of monopoly. But now, as then, a large majority of the party are materially opposed to the principle of financial control by such means. They are not disposed to see the money of the Constitution subverted and the credit of individuals and corporations substituted. It must be apparent to all close observers of current popular sentiment that any currency system which presupposes a permanent interest-bearing debt will not be tolerated by our people.

A permanent public debt saddled with the power to be used to control and manipulate Congressional legislation upon the financial question is contrary to the genius of our institutions, and as Mr. Benton well said, "is not suited for a republic." Mr. Seligman, a New York banker, in his testimony before the Congressional Committee investigating the Panama Canal scandal in this country as well as France, made it plain how the argus eyes of the thousands of banks of issue in this country, focussed on the Congress through the means of a subsidized press and telegraph, might be brought to bear to create public apprehensions and thus terrorize Congress to do their corrupt bidding. We want no dictation from this quarter, nor any such copartnership in our financial system.

If the Democratic party is true to its teachings and present tendencies it will, in time, restore the country where the Constitution and the Fathers put it, that is, the right to the free use of both precious metals as money, and bank paper to be relegated where it belongs, viz., the various States. This will decentralize our present system. It will take from National Banks the power to control Congress in the interests of monetary and political centralization—a centralization that means legislation for the rich and powerful banks and the consequent degradation of the States and impoverishment of the people. We are fast entering upon an era in our history when these issues must be met and fought out, as they were met and settled in the days of Jackson and Benton.

It would be well for the Democratic party and for the country could the questions of taxation and reduction of pensions, as well as a reduction of expenditures all along the line, be settled before entering the bitter struggle over the money question. The money question must, however, be met sometime. When it is forced as the issue it may develop a necessity for a reorganization of political parties. The battle of the standards is the coming battle the world over, when it is pushed to the front for final settlement—the question as to whether silver shall be placed at its old status as the equal, if not the superior, of gold in our financial system, or totally demonetized. It will be a battle royal.

The time is not to be long deferred when this battle of the standards will be fought to a finish. On the one side will be arrayed the rich and powerful banks of the Old World and of the

New; on the other, the mass of our people, especially those west of the Allegheny Mountains, loaded down as they are with debts and mortgages, with a vast country yet to be touched by the hand of industry and enterprize, demanding money without limit except as to its supply from nature.

The money question when brought forward for final solution must of necessity involve the question of the standard; whether it shall be a standard resting upon both metals, gold and silver, or the single standard of gold. Compromises and makeshifts have heretofore only checked the fighting. When pressed forward, as it seems may be done ahead of tariff, and all other reforms promised by the Democratic party, the peril of defeat for tariff reductions, pension reforms, and other reforms in our expenditures is great. It may be that those who wish to postpone and defeat tariff reform are more than willing to press other great measures ahead of it. The Democratic party will make a great mistake if such should be the policy adopted.

It is difficult to see how any more compromises can be had on the question of the currency; especially will it be difficult to reconcile the conflict between the demand for total demonetization of silver and its unconditional restoration. When the question is again pressed forward it is difficult to see how there can be any other solution—the total abandonment of silver or its restoration to its constitutional privileges at our mints. The special plea to await the concurrence of other nations can no longer be entertained. The last international conference at Brussels developed the fact that there is no probability of any agreement on this question.

The time has come when our sixty-five or seventy millions of people must act independently. No limping or stilted standard such as we now have can long survive. Silver is either a safe money metal or it is not. If it is not suitable for free coinage it ought not to be further coined. If it is suitable for coinage at all it ought not to be debased by limiting its coinage.

It is fair to assume that the Democratic party will still oppose National Banks, that this party will not tolerate the increase and manipulation of the public debt for the purpose of turning over or farming out our system of money to banks of issue. If so the logical result is to look to silver and gold to take the place of bank issues. Gold is not sufficient to answer this purpose, hence

silver must and will continue to constitute our supply to meet the great demands made for money by our vastly increasing business and population.

What safer system can be devised than that of gold and silver freely coined, with the coin note issue in the metal as a basis, dollar for dollar? There can be none. As to the ratio or relative amount of the metals that shall be equal in debt-paying power, that is now, as it always has been, a question under the Constitution for Congress to determine.

It is possible that a compromise may again be effected by the amendment or repeal of the Sherman law and the substitution of a system that would coin all silver bullion coming into the hands of the government, basing all notes on the silver dollar, without the gold redemption clause, as in the Act of 1878, known as the Bland-Allison Act, with increase of the minimum amount authorized to be coined by that Act. But the difficulties in the way of this are many, for the opponents of silver would probably oppose it, and no true friend of silver could counsel anything less as a substitute for the present law, defective though it confessedly is.

R. P. BLAND.

II.—THE BRUSSELS CONFERENCE REVIEWED.

BY THE HON. CHARLES FOSTER, EX-SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

IT IS not my purpose to formulate any proposition for the United States that in my opinion ought to be proposed to the adjourned meeting of the International Monetary Conference when it reassembles in Brussels in May next, or to express an opinion as to the probable result of such meeting, but to present in a brief form the reasons actuating the President and the Secretary of the Treasury in calling the Conference, the steps taken to secure the coöperation of the different governments, a synopsis of the proceedings, and the impressions to be gathered therefrom. From these *data* your readers can form their own judgment as to what may be accomplished at the reassembling of the Conference.

Foreseeing the inevitable result to this country if its present silver policy was to be pursued, and being firm believers in the use of both gold and silver as money metals, the

President and the Secretary of the Treasury felt that every effort within their power should be used to restore silver to its former use as money among the nations.

A brief history of the Latin Union and of former monetary conferences is thought not to be out of place here.

The Latin Union was formed on the 23d of December, 1865, by a convention signed by France, Italy, Switzerland, and Belgium, to which Greece became a party a few years later. The chief incentive that led to its formation was a desire to provide for those countries a uniform metallic currency, in order to prevent the exportation from them of their silver coins,—an exportation which had begun as early as 1850, in consequence of the change in the relative commercial value of the precious metals, caused by the unprecedented production of gold in California and Australasia, and the resulting substitution of gold for silver in their monetary systems.

Previous to the foundation of the Union there had existed, *de facto*, a monetary agreement among the four states originally constituting it, as Italy, Belgium, and Switzerland had adopted the French monetary régime created by the law of April 6, 1803, the unit of which was the silver franc, and which granted legal currency to gold at the coinage ratio to silver of 1 to 15½. The contracting states preserved the double standard, but accorded the charater of legal-tender to the five-franc silver piece only. They stipulated that all silver pieces of less value than the five-franc piece should be limited trade. Each of the states agreed to receive into its treasuries the coins stamped by the others, without limitation as to value in the case of gold coins and five-franc silver pieces, and to the amount of 100 francs in case of other silver pieces in any one payment. The latter were to be legal-tender, in the country that issued them, to the amount of 50 francs between individuals, and to be redeemed, by the issuing country, in gold. Their coinage was reserved to the states, respectively, and was restricted to six francs per capita.

By special conventions in 1874, 1875, 1876, and 1878, the Union first limited and then suspended the coinage of the five-franc silver pieces.

The Convention of 1865 was concluded for fifteen years. It was renewed in 1878 for five years, and again, in 1885, for a like period. It is still in force, by virtue of tacit renewal from year

to year. By the terms of the Convention of 1885, the suspension of the coinage of full legal-tender silver is continued, while gold coins and five-franc silver pieces continue to have unlimited debt-paying power.

So much for the Latin Union. Now as to the International Monetary Conferences which preceded that of 1892 :

The first International Monetary Conference—that of 1867—met in Paris on the 17th of June of that year, at the invitation of the French Government. It was called "to consider the question of uniformity of coinage and to seek for the basis of ulterior negotiations." Twenty countries were represented at it. It failed to come to any agreement as to the means of realizing the object for which it had been called, and adjourned on July 6, after holding seven sessions, at the last of which it was voted to refer its decisions to the several states for diplomatic action, and to invite them to transmit their answers to the French Government before February 16, 1868. This Conference did not meet again.

The next International Monetary Conference was that of 1878. It was called by the President of the United States, who, by the Act of February 28, 1878, was authorized "to invite the governments of Europe to join in a conference to adopt a common ratio between gold and silver for the purpose of establishing internationally the use of bimetallic money, and securing fixity of the relative value between those metals." The Conference met in Paris on August 16, 1878. Twelve countries were represented at it. In the sixth session, Mr. Say, the President, declared in the name of the European delegates that they recognized: *First*, That it was necessary to maintain in the world the monetary functions of silver as well as of gold, but that the selection of the one or the other, or of both simultaneously, should be governed by the special situation of each State or group of States. *Second*, That the question of the limitation of the coinage of silver should likewise be left to the discretion of each state or group of states. *Third*, That the differences of opinion which had appeared excluded the adoption of a common ratio between the two metals. From this declaration, the representatives of the United States expressed their dissent.

The Conference of 1881 was called in January of that year, by the Governments of France and the United States, "to examine

and adopt, for the purpose of submitting the same to the governments represented, a plan and a system for the establishment, by means of an international agreement, of the use of gold and silver as bimetallic money, according to a settled relative value between those metals." It met in Paris, April 19. Nineteen countries were represented. It held thirteen sessions, at the last of which the President, Mr. Magnin, Minister of Finance of the French Republic, read a resolution saying that, in view of the speeches and observations of the delegates of the several governments, there was ground for believing that an understanding might be established between the states which had taken part in the Conference, but that it was expedient to suspend its meetings; that the monetary situation of some States might call for governmental action; that there was reason for giving an opportunity for diplomatic negotiations; and that therefore the Conference would adjourn to April 12, 1882.

This resolution was adopted. The Conference adjourned, but was not convened again.

The International Monetary Conference that assembled in Paris during the French Exposition, in October, 1889, had no official character. Its members, however, failed to agree on any solution of the silver question.

Early in the year 1891 the Government of the United States took the initiatory steps toward calling another international conference. A correspondence was opened with certain well-known Americans of recognized position and financial knowledge and standing, temporarily residing in Europe, with a view to ascertaining the views of prominent officials of foreign governments on this subject, and the willingness of the leading nations to confer on the subject. Early in the negotiations it became apparent that all the European governments were inclined to favor the Conference if an agreement could be reached with Great Britain. Happily it was found that Lord Salisbury's government felt favorably disposed to the calling of a conference.

At this point the subject was taken up officially by the State Department, and through our Minister at London, Mr. Robert Lincoln, Great Britain agreed to join in the Conference. President Harrison couched the invitation in the very general terms agreed upon with Great Britain. In the language of our Chief Magistrate, they were asked to send delegates "to consider by

what means, if any, the use of silver can be increased in the currency systems of the nations." The invitation was accepted by all the states invited, twenty in number, and the Conference, after several delays, caused by circumstances not necessary to mention here, met at Brussels on the 22d of last November, all the delegates being present at the opening of the Conference.

It will be noticed that the date of the meeting of the Conference was after the Presidential election. A President representing the opposite political party was to succeed President Harrison, upon whose invitation the Conference had been called. The attitude of the incoming administration upon the great question with which the Conference was to deal could not then be known. Not only had a change of administration been decreed in this country, but an actual change of administration had taken place in Great Britain since the Conference was agreed upon—a change there from an administration favoring bimetallism or the enlarged use of silver to one strongly in favor of a single gold standard. The change of administration in this country was a source of embarrassment in the matter of preparing the instructions to our delegates, and to the delegates themselves during the deliberations of the Conference.

The substance of the instructions to our delegates is here given:

"It is the opinion of the President, and, as he believes, of the people of the United States, with a singular unanimity, that a full use of silver as a coined metal, at a ratio to gold to be fixed by an agreement between the great commercial nations the world, would very highly promote the prosperity of all the people of all the countries of the world. For this reason your first and most important duty will be to secure, if possible, an agreement among the chief commercial countries of the world looking to international bimetallism; that is, the unlimited coinage of gold and silver into money of full debt-paying power at a fixed ratio in coinage common to all the agreeing powers.

"You should not lose sight of the fact that no arrangement will be acceptable to the people or satisfactory to the Government of the United States which would by any possibility place this country on a silver basis while European countries maintain the single gold standard.

"Failing to secure international bimetallism, the next important duty will be to secure, if possible, some action upon the part of European countries looking to a larger use of silver as currency in order to put an end to the further depreciation of that metal."

It was suggested to the delegates before leaving the United States that, in view of the change of administration, failing to

secure an agreement at the Conference, an effort should be made to take a recess to such date as would give the incoming administration an opportunity for full consideration of the subject.

The importance of the Conference, and the desire to reach a satisfactory solution, is evidenced by the opening remarks of the Prime Minister of Belgium :

"The Conference in which you are called upon to take part has for its object the consideration of the most serious, complex and arduous problem which is presented to modern society.

"It (money) affects all economic and social interests, it affects the commerce of the world, and is the real reason of more than one unexplained crisis."

M. Montefiore Levi, the distinguished Belgian Senator who presided over the Conference, also strongly emphasized the importance of the subject :

"The depreciation of silver so far as it serves as a monetary standard finds an echo throughout the social organism.

"But the principal evil of the present situation lies in the instability that flows from it.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

"Whatever may be the result of your deliberations, one may surely affirm that, convinced of the considerable influence which the solution of a question so complex as that submitted to you may have upon the progress of universal civilization, you will have it at heart to investigate the possibility of remedying the condition of affairs of which none mistake the gravity."

At the commencement of the sessions the United States presented the following resolution :

"That in the opinion of this Conference it is desirable that some measure should be formed for increasing the use of silver in the currency systems of the nations."

Declarations favorable to the resolution were made by the delegates from Great Britain and by the delegates from other countries who spoke, but the resolution was not put to a formal vote.

In addition to the above resolution the delegates from the United States presented for the consideration of the Conference a statement of their views in regard to the silver question and recommended the adoption of International bimetallism as follows :

1. Unrestricted coinage of both gold and silver into money of full debt-paying power.
2. Fixing the ratio in coinage between the two metals.

They also submitted proposals looking to the retirement of small gold coins and small paper money redeemable in gold, at the same time cordially inviting proposals from other delegates and that they be given precedence.

Mr. Alfred de Rothschild, one of the English delegates, presented a proposition for the purchase of silver by Europe, in the following language:

"The American Government are purchasers of silver to the extent of 54 millions of ounces yearly, and I would suggest that, on condition these purchases were continued, the different European Powers should combine to make certain yearly purchases, say to the extent of about £5,000,000 sterling annually, such purchases to be continued over a period of five years at a price not exceeding 43 pence per ounce standard, but if silver should rise above that price the purchases for the time being to be immediately suspended.

"Gentlemen, I need hardly remind you that the stock of silver in the world is estimated at some thousands of millions, and if this Conference were to break up without arriving at any definite result there would be a depreciation in the value of that commodity which it would be frightful to contemplate, and out of which a monetary panic would ensue, the far-spreading effects of which it would be impossible to foretell."

Many other plans for the enlarged use of silver as money were presented by distinguished delegates, all of which, except the general plan of bimetallism presented by the United States, were referred to a committee of thirteen delegates for examination and report. The committee made two elaborate reports, and while reporting affirmatively on only one proposition, viz., the retirement of small gold coins and paper money, they were unanimously of the opinion that both this proposition and the De Rothschild purchase plan, as modified by M. de Osma, of Spain, should be brought before the Conference for discussion.

The attitude of the various governments towards the proposals, as disclosed by the utterances of the delegates, was substantially as follows:

The representatives of Great Britain, Germany, Austria-Hungary, the Scandinavian countries, Turkey, and Portugal, while favoring the gold standard, expressed themselves as willing to carefully consider any plan which might be proposed by leading commercial nations. The Netherlands, Spain, Mexico, and the United

States favored international bimetallism. The states of the Latin Union, upon whose attitude to a large extent the situation turned, speaking through M. Tirard, the present French Minister of Finance, declared that owing to the fact that they were already saturated with silver currency they could not favor the adoption of bimetallism unless Great Britain, Germany and the other monometallic powers of Europe would also adopt it. At the same time M. Tirard, speaking of the Latin Union, said :

"I do not know yet what will come out of the Conference and to what practical result it may lead, but this much is certain, our labors will not in any case be fruitless."

After a full discussion of the monetary situation and the attitude of the various governments had been revealed, the sentiment seemed to be general that a long recess should be taken to enable the delegates to confer with their respective governments. This was proposed by Baron de Renzis (Italian delegate), and ably seconded by M. de Osma (delegate from Spain). The latter said :

"There has always been in our discussions a certain dominant and unmistakable character which is supported by the evidence of attitude more eloquently than words, viz.: The presence of a general good will inspired by the existence of a crisis generally felt, but with different degrees of intensity. Whatever personal sympathies we may feel, we must admit that very few of us have been able to agree with the stoic opinion which denies the existence of a crisis and concludes very logically that there is no need of looking for a remedy."

The President in closing the Conference said :

"At the moment when we suspend our labors we carry with us, I regret to say, the very general impression of an uneasiness which calls for a remedy : but we cherish at the same time the hope that palliatives, or possibly a combination of palliatives, may perhaps be found to conjure the evil by the aid of an international agreement or understanding. We have, finally, I venture to assert, a lively and sincere desire to come together again, with the conviction that we shall be better equipped to reach a successful result than when we began our labors."

The financial disaster which may ensue in case of a failure of the leading nations to come to an understanding on this subject is evidenced by the utterances generally of the delegates, and in this respect attention is especially called to the extract from the remarks of the English delegate, being a member of the great banking house of De Rothschild.

CHARLES FOSTER.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

"BY WOMEN FOR WOMEN."

DINAH, the sweet woman preacher in *Adam Bede*, often had things "borne in upon her mind." Is it not "borne in upon" the sensible women of to-day that there is an alarming amount of trash being written by women for women? The chief offender is the daily press. Magazines sift more carefully, and we all know the moral tone of most of the successful women's publications to be above criticism. But it is the "Society Column," of the Sunday and week-day newspaper which we arraign—the columns headed "Fair Women's World," "Follies of the Fair," "Feminine Foibles," and the like—pardon a strong quotation from Shakespeare—"damnable iteration."

Well for the men that such columns are so labelled, otherwise they might read themselves into attacks of nausea.

But what of the women for whom such columns are so labelled? The press declares that it "caters to popular taste." In the name of all robust and normal womanhood, where do the mental and physical inanities reside who crave such pabulum?

From a pile of respectable city journals, gathered absolutely at random, I have compiled a few choice illustrations. The writers cover a large range of subjects with great impartiality. They write of actresses, clothes, Russian tea, complexions, corsets, and sleeves with a versatility that suggests the combination of "scissors and hope, smiles and soap" in the "Hunting of the Snark!"

One article unfolds a plan whereby two sisters may become—useful and happy? Oh, no, "decorative" and "effective." In condensing the scheme I will omit quotation marks, but retain as far as possible the phraseology, as being likewise both "decorative" and "effective." Girls who go in for this sort of thing can set each other off by wearing gowns that suit each other, and posing about harmoniously, making pictures of themselves. They should, of course, provide themselves with good contrasting complexions. One might be, for instance, a vivid blonde and the other a dull-ashen blonde. As a basis of operations a corner is very appropriately suggested where they may best weave the web of their fascinations. The writer assures us it works beautifully for both; the pretty one, who hasn't very much brains, attracts the admirers to the corner, and once they are there the plain but brilliant sister does the entertaining.

While it hardly seems worth while to adopt a superior moral attitude towards such an effusion as this, we cannot refrain from charging the writer with a daring plagiarism on the good old nursery fable of the Spider and the Fly.

Another of these authorities tells us that Empire frocks, being worn without stays, have a distinctly demoralizing tendency, for a woman without corsets "loses all moral backbone and wants to loaf on divans, read

novels, and drink tea or smoke cigarettes." Still another of these babblers —who seem to be the lineal descendants of Tennyson's "Brook"—gives hints for the furnishing of a boudoir. Statistics are not at hand for the number of women in the United States outside of novels who own boudoirs. The boudoir is first defined: It is the room where a woman "thinks, dreams, dresses, talks and reads." The bed must be a "dainty dream," the pillows "snowy invitations." A silver rack must hold the ivory-backed brushes of the "spotless washing-stand," the toilet-table must have its "pretty profusion of oxidized silver, cut glass and flowers," but, "of course the principal thing is the looking-glass." The writing-table must "lock into privacy the love secrets of its owner," and contain two or three sorts of letter-paper "for friends, for business, for lovers, and so on." If the possessor of this boudoir be "a great reader and accumulate literature (?) quickly," she must have, beside a shelf for the poets, a "real bookcase to provide for every one of Ouida's new works and each one of Marie Corelli's." Lastly, pictures, for "what is any room without them? A few daring French water colors are pretty, or some photo-engravings or etchings of poetical semi-nude figures."

Is any comment necessary, or possible? I am uncovering no new atrocity. Every one knows the brand, and these are no worse than dozens of other contributions from dozens of other industrious scribblers for the society column. One can but admire the pluck with which these writers, starting with a poor weakly little bacillus of an idea, succeed by careful propagation in making it fill two columns.

Nearly all women have with mistaken conscientiousness worried through such columns in search of new hints for house, dress, or table. The greater the dilution the stronger the dose, according to Hahnemann and this species of literary woman.

The wonder is how they ever harden into print. And the question is, whether this idiocy is harmless. Does it strengthen the moral fibre of American girls and women and prepare them for what is truly their "higher sphere," which is, I take it, *not* the boudoir? Or does it set false gods in place of pure and healthful ideals?

I trust these conundrums are not like those in *Alice in Wonderland*, which had no answers.

Meantime, however, it seems unfair that so large a body of women as, judging from the space assigned to them in the newspapers, the readers of these columns must constitute, should go unrepresented. They should at least be seen at the World's Fair, probably under glass cases—in the Woman's Building, where they can "pose about harmoniously."

LILLIAN A. MERCUR.

DO THE FITTEST SURVIVE?

IS INSANITY increasing in civilized communities? Is the proportion of blind increasing? Is the proportion of deaf increasing? Is the proportion of paupers increasing? Is the proportion of criminals increasing? A recent writer, who is declared to be both "eminent" and "scientific," thinks so and tries to make others think so. He holds that the defective population in the United States was in 1880 five times as great as it was in 1850. In support of his conclusion he quotes a table from the census of 1880. To

this I add the figures for 1890 so as to make it complete, and it stands thus:

Year.	Total population.	Defectives.
1850	23,191,876	50,994
1860	31,448,821	68,451
1870	38,558,871	98,484
1880	50,155,788	251,698
1890	62,622,250	293,519

These "defectives" include only the insane, the idiotic, the blind and the deaf and dumb. I have obtained from Dr. John S. Billings, in charge of the division of the vital statistics in the Census office, the following important classification of these for forty years, including the census just made, and also the relative number of "dependants" (paupers who are publicly provided for), and "delinquents" (people in prison):

Classes.	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.	1890.
Defectives:					
Insane	15,610	24,042	37,432	91,997	106,254
Idiots	15,787	18,930	24,527	76,895	95,571
Blind	9,794	12,658	20,320	44,928	50,411
Deafmutes	9,803	12,821	16,205	33,878	41,283
Dependants:					
Paupers	50,353	82,942	76,737	66,203	73,045
Delinquents:					
Prisoners	6,737	19,086	32,901	58,609	71,424

The writer alluded to, whose views are spread on the pages of a reputable magazine, says that "the ratio of insane in public and private institutions of the United States is to the entire population as 156 to 1,000!" This would give us a total of 9,672,000 lunatics—about 91 times greater than the total number of insane, according to the present census. In fact, instead of being 156 to 1,000, there are less than 2 to 1,000. The following table given me by Dr. Billings shows the percentage of defectives according to the censuses of 1880 and 1890:

	1880.	1890.
Insane in a million	1,833	1,697
Idiots in a million	1,533	1,526
Blind in a million	976	805
Deafmutes in a million	675	656

It will be observed that the percentage is less in every case in 1890 than in 1880, which, under the same conditions, would imply a relative or actual diminution of the number of the afflicted. But, as a matter of fact, the conditions are not similar. In 1880 Dr. Wines succeeded in obtaining personal reports from no less than 80,000 physicians, which enabled him to make his chronicle peculiarly complete. The same considerations will apply to previous censuses. They were all taken not only under varying conditions, but largely by different methods and for different ends. As the enumeration occurs only once in ten years it must be made by almost an entirely new corps every time; and it can almost be said that there are no census experts, as there is certainly no uniform system. So it is much more probable that the great apparent differences are due to imperfect enumeration, becoming each decade less and less imperfect, than that there were three times as many insane and idiotic in 1880 as in 1870, or five times as many in 1890 as in 1850.

The writer to whom I have alluded infers an increase in insanity from the fact that in 1881 there were 56,205 treated in asylums, while in 1889 there were 97,535—an increase of 73 per cent. But do the figures justify the conclusion or even tend to justify it? They might be further strengthened, or,

at any rate, lengthened, by showing that both the deaf mutes and blind in American asylums have greatly increased from decade to decade, as follows:

	Deaf in asylums.	Blind in asylums.
1850	5,019	3,444
1860	9,121	6,087
1870	15,627	9,117
1880	31,586	13,856
1890	59,657	23,981

I submit that these interesting facts do not warrant the assertion that the "defective" have increased in numbers. The multiplication of lunatic asylums does not imply an increase of lunatics but an increase of benevolence. In 1850 the cost of supporting the public paupers of New York City was only $9,863, while in 1890 it was $3,794,972—four hundred times as much. But this, instead of proving that there are four hundred times as many paupers, simply proves that there is four hundred times as much willingness to feed, clothe and shelter paupers.

As civilization advances, social sympathy becomes more active and takes the form of assistance to the decrepit, the insane, the blind, and otherwise disabled, and of help to the poor and restraint to the penal classes, and it is much more probable that many of these unfortunates were without attention in 1850 than it is that they have quintupled during these four decades.

Nobody would think of inferring a vast increase of ignorance in this country, from the fact that there had been a vast increase in the number of schoolhouses, but this seems to be exactly the logic relied on to prove that our incompetent and afflicted classes are increasing. A few years ago a member of Congress proved that there was ten times as much illiteracy in Massachusetts as in Mexico by pointing to the statistics of illiteracy, whereas the fact was that so large a proportion of Mexicans could not read or write that no notice was taken of the fact. It is well known that a hundred years ago scarcely any attention was paid to the insane in any land on earth. In this country there are now 113 public insane asylums, but there were only two when this century began and only 11 before 1840. Virginia built the first in 1773; the Quakers of Pennsylvania followed with another in 1797. Connecticut and Kentucky imitated their examples in 1824 and South Carolina two years later. Of all of our refuges for the feeble or wandering-minded, two-thirds have been built since the war for the Union. Before that time most of the insane who were cared for at all were kept in the almshouses of the land; and in the previous decades there were almost no asylums, and the deranged were, if poor and friendless, permitted to wander at will along the roads and over the fields, sleeping where they could and living or dying as chance directed. Now that every State and almost every community has some sort of an asylum and the unfortunate wanderers are gathered up and housed, the philanthropic kindness is quoted as a proof that insanity is rapidly increasing. Statistics show that there are one hundred times as many blind people in proportion to the population in New York as there are in Egypt, because in Egypt such a very large proportion are blind that no official record whatever is made of it. So it is of all the other afflictions of the defective.

It is the fashion of "labor" orators to affirm that tramps are rapidly increasing in number under prevailing industrial conditions, and even such a writer as Mr. Henry George has estimated them at "millions" in this coun-

try alone. Of course, no proof of the tremendous multiplication is offered, for there is none to be had. I doubt if there are as many tramps in proportion to our population as there were fifty years ago, and my doubt is founded on the notorious facts that the workingman's wages have more than doubled in that time and the cost of almost everything that the workingman has to buy has been reduced nearly one-half. In other words, an hour's labor will buy and actually does buy three times as much as it would buy fifty years ago. In regard to "tramps" only one thing is new—that is, the name. The very same genus was known to my mother, but she called them "codgers;" the very same genus was known to my grandmother, but she called them "shacks." What my great-grandmother called them I do not know, but I doubt not that the professional rounders were as common then as now. There were no "tramps" then, because the name was not invented till our armies were disbanded. There were no "dudes" then, either, but there have been dandies, swells, fops, beaux and exquisites scattered plentifully down the centuries. Names change; the thing persists.

The actual state of the case cannot be proved, it seems to me, but can only be inferred. We know that the average health of the people of every civilized land is much higher than it was fifty or even twenty-five years ago. We know that the average life of man has been prolonged two years since 1850, and that that prolongation results from better food, better clothing, better drainage and ventilation and wiser sanitary conditions everywhere. Is it not a fair deduction that the causes which result in longer life also result in sounder minds and less defective organs?

The same course of reasoning applied to the criminal classes results in analogous conclusions. Never in the history of man were offenders against the law treated with so much decision, combined with so much kindness, as at present, and it is affirmed by those who have made a study of punitive methods that never before has so large a proportion of offenders been brought to justice. The records of these would, of course, seem to show that crime is increasing, while they would really show only that crime and criminals are more thoroughly under the ban of law. Indeed, many actions are now illegal which were before legal; many are considered criminal which were before venial or even regarded as entirely proper, and such offences added would tend towards the erroneous conclusion alluded to. When our methods of treating criminals, lunatics, idiots and all the defective classes shall have been uniform for a sufficient time to enable trustworthy comparison to be made, it will probably be found that the same causes of improved food and shelter and better sanitation, which are resulting in increasing length of human life, are also resulting harmoniously in diminishing the proportion of those who prey upon their fellow men and those who on account of their infirmities are a burden upon society.

W. A. CROFFUT.

THE ABUSE OF SECRECY.

UNTRUTHFULNESS is believed by many to be the most conspicuous and lamentable evil of our times. It is said to be so widespread and insidious that it is like unaërated blood pulsating in the social arteries, carrying poison into the structures that need nutritious elements. This melancholy view receives some support from facts. Nevertheless, whatever degree of stability we find in commercial and social relations is evidence of a corre-

sponding degree of general veracity. For untruthfulness is a decomposing force of such power that among wholly unreliable individuals the integration necessary to a complex social life would be impossible. The unquestioning acceptance by most people of the idea that lying is an evil must have had its origin in experience tending to establish an association between untruthfulness and disintegration.

But the recognition of veracity as a useful and essential part of the machinery of civilization does not exclude the possibility that occasional and exceptional inveracity, concealment or evasion may be approved by the most rigid course of reasoning. When an apparent occasion for the exercise of wise inveracity has arisen it would seem to demand an examination of its claim to special treatment. Or, if large numbers of people be exhorted to conceal, whether by silence, evasion, or actual falsehood, facts known to them, they may reasonably ask for sound way-marks of philosophy to guide them in a path so uncertain.

"Is the sewer cleansed by calling aloud that it is foul?" asks a writer. It is seriously questioned by many whether society is benefited by exposures of its crimes and follies. Many considerations array themselves against the claims of frankness, considerations of policy and of sympathy; those of policy embracing patriotic, religious, social, and business interests. Except in its distinctly emotional aspect, patriotism busies itself with desires for military, commercial, and social supremacy. In a time of almost universal peace among nations, and of decaying taste for warfare, the military excuse for covering social cesspools cannot be offered. Commercial and social relations cannot be perceptibly affected by knowledge of facts which bear with almost equal weight upon all great cities, and which are already well known to the controllers of trade and the leaders of society. If the tides of migration set less persistently towards any particular locality on account of the revelations,—a very improbable supposition,—that should be matter for joy to those whose fears of over-population sometimes reach legislative halls and culminate in acts of exclusion.

The expediency of concealing facts which, if known, might influence in an undesirable manner the attitude of the public towards an organization, such as the church, must be at least balanced by danger of accidental exposure that would result in disasters immeasurably augmented by the attempted concealment, which might be construed into sanction.

Societary motives for deceiving the general public are various and complex. Each class desires to maintain ascendancy over inferiors, equality with the different groups on its own plane and such favor as it may have with superiors, if any be acknowledged. The critique does not often enter into personal details, neither does it construct syllogisms which, too comprehensive, touch all the members of a certain circle or class. It does not say:

"Mr. A is a drunkard," nor "All men who belong to the exclusive circle in the town of B. are drunkards; Mr. A belongs to the exclusive circle in the town of B., therefore Mr. A is a drunkard."

It does not even state the major premise from which such a conclusion must inevitably be drawn. Nevertheless, the imputations are often sweeping enough to touch the pride of each unit in a great class as if he were individually assailed.

Certain business interests may be imperilled to an alarming degree by disclosures which appear to bear no relation to them. For instance: In a

town of 25,000 inhabitants the only first class opera-house in the place falls, in the estimation of the populace, to second class because of certain practices of the management suddenly disclosed to the public. This revelation affects the business not only of those directly connected with theatrical affairs, but also of florists and dressmakers whose productions were supplied to occupants of the boxes, parquette, and dress-circle.

But a criticism of a large class as a whole, or of the population of a city or country in gross has, usually, an exceedingly indirect, very remote, and altogether inappreciable effect, if any at all, upon individual business interests.

The motives most potent in securing evasions and partial or entire suppression of truth is solicitude for the welfare of those who might, it is argued, be influenced to do hurtful things by knowledge that hurtful things are done. A child is to be sent through the *habitat* of wolves, his defence being unconsciousness of their presence or belief that they are sheep. To protect us from a contagion we are to be kept in ignorance that its victims walk among us and sit beside us.

If it be conceded that some things should be concealed, we are plunged into deeper confusion by the question: "What things?" All persons who excuse atrocious punishments of criminals, or any punishments, on grounds of deterrent effect, must desire their favorite barbarity to be made as public as possible in order that the effect may be wide spread. These persons cannot consistently advocate concealment of any criminal proceedings, whatever classes may be affected by them, while those who do not believe that others are deterred from the commission of crime by knowledge of the sufferings of the condemned will usually support the view that criminal proceedings should be open in order that all may judge of the equal fairness with which justice is administered.

Should crime, itself, be concealed? Such a course, besides being manifestly out of harmony with the mental states of a people whose pleasure in criminal-catching is only exceeded by its delight in pugilistic contests, and therefore impracticable, would involve a general knowledge of the essence of human conduct, of what constitutes crime, seldom compassed even by philosophers and not to be confidently looked for in persons of average ability and attainments.

Shall brutalities, such as child-beating for technical offences against well-defended parents or of pigeon-shooting for no offences at all, be subjects for concealment? Unchanging conditions produce unchanging results. When victims of brutality are not able to offer resistance some exterior force must effect whatever changes take place, and if the brutalities remain unknown excepting to the perpetrators, the victims and the witnesses, whence shall arise that sentiment of disapprobation which from small beginnings finally grows strong enough to act as a powerful resistant?

Shall follies pass unmentioned? It is even harder to decide what is foolish than to decide what is criminal and what is brutal. The growth of every social group must be assisted by knowledge of the customs of other groups. It is not essential that isolated facts relating to few persons and having no particular significance be known, but other facts having a wider significance and the telling of which cannot painfully affect any individual, excepting for unsubstantial, sentimental reasons, may, it would seem, properly become widely known. Such knowledge acts as a powerful agent in the

rectifying of popular errors, sifting that which is essentially evil from that which is only conventionally evil, and setting forth the proper bases of actions in clearer lights and stronger colors. For instance, it is said in criticism of the women of a certain city that they venture out after nightfall without male escorts. Adjacent cities stand on tiptoe to look at these shameless creatures. The air is filled with dust and stones hurled at them by scandalized civilization. But the women persist. Their marketing, shopping, calling, and visiting places of amusement in the evening go placidly on. By-and-by a scientist investigates the facts and finds that these women are as safe on the streets as they are in the most sacred, exclusive, down-lined nests of homes; that the city is quiet and well-lighted, and that assaults upon women who mind their own business are practically unknown. Next a philosopher arises who teaches the people that the Turkish women's custom of wearing veils in the presence of men is no more a superstition than the custom of women remaining indoors after twilight in localities where there is nothing to fear outside. He teaches that acts should be approved or condemned for rational reasons, and not because they conform or do not conform to standards that had their origin among different environments, and grew out of conditions which no longer exist. A few listen, popular prejudices weaken, rationality grows, and gradually large numbers of women learn to adjust their movements to a real, not a fanciful, environment. Thus social revelations may be conducive to benefits neither suspected nor intended by the revealers. They may lead to discoveries that tendencies popularly supposed to be towards disease are really towards health.

Children, slaves, the sane among maniacs and the philosopher among savages must resort to concealments, falsehoods and evasions as means of protection against the brutalities of power; but a people with nothing tangible to fear can have only petty and childish excuses for covering its customs from the eyes of the world.

Ignorance is perilous; knowledge is helpful, necessary. Dangers to be avoided must be known. Every individual finds the knowledge tending to self-preservation more useful than any other. Questions of justice to be decided must be discussed. Folly to be denounced, wisdom to be commended, error to be recognized, tendencies to be studied, re-adjustments to be made, sociological inductions to be drawn, require that the related facts be laid bare unreservedly and collected and arranged with scrupulous care.

CLARA DIXON DAVIDSON.

ENGLISH POOR LAW REFORM.

THE demand for an inquiry into the working of the English Poor Law, which Mr. Gladstone's Government has met by the appointment of a Royal Commission, has come from two different quarters—from politicians who are unconnected with Poor Law administration, and from those who may be regarded as experts in it.

For half a century or more the Poor Law has had no place in national politics, and its local administration has been much freer from party politics than has the administration of municipal government. The Poor Law was placed on an entirely new basis after the investigation of the Royal Commission of 1834, and has not been materially interfered with by Parliament since that time.

Although it is less than eighteen months since the demand for an inquiry into the working of the Poor Law assumed national importance, there has been for some years in London an association for the Reform of the Poor Laws. Its members were for the most part Radicals. They were not numerically strong; little was heard of the work, but at the annual election of Poor Law Guardians in London, it has been their practice to put forward candidates pledged to their programme.

It was, however, only when Mr. Chamberlain launched his Old Age Pension scheme, at the beginning of 1892, that the demand for an inquiry into the working of the Poor Law became general. Mr. Chamberlain's contention that the Poor Law had failed in its dealing with deserving old people, who were no longer able to maintain themselves, was supported by Mr. John Morley, who dealt with the question in speeches at Newcastle-on-Tyne, and at Sale, near Manchester, within a few weeks after the publication of Mr. Chamberlain's article in the *National Review*.

At Newcastle, when addressing a meeting composed almost exclusively of the members of friendly societies, Mr. Morley asked: "Has the time come when there should be an examination as to whether the provisions and practice of the year 1834 should be modified in regard to old age?" and "Are we to make the operation of the law more elastic in that particular field?" The answers given by his audience to Mr. Morley's questions were in the affirmative; and between the date of the Newcastle speech and the General Election, local Radical Associations in different parts of the country adopted Reform of the Poor Laws as one of the planks in their electioneering programme, and pressed Parliamentary candidates who sought their suffrages to pledge themselves to the movement for an inquiry by Royal Commission.

After the General Election, when it was seen that the appointment of a Royal Commission would be secured, members of Poor Law Guardians Boards also began to advocate an inquiry, and to indicate some of the questions to which they would like to direct the attention of the Commission. As the appointment of the Commission will be due principally to the demands of the Radical Poor Law Reformers, it will be as well to state the questions they desire to bring before the Commissioners, and then to outline those which will be submitted by the Poor Law experts.

In the first place the Radicals ask for more elasticity in the administration of the Poor Law—so far as it touches old and deserving poor—those who are in the workhouse through no fault of their own, and who before they sought its shelter had a life-long record of honesty, industry, and good citizenship. The Poor Law, as at present administered, draws no distinction between people of this kind and those whose whole lives have been vicious and criminal. Inside the workhouse all the people are herded together on exactly the same level, no attempt whatever being made to distinguish between them. This, the Radical Poor Law reformers urge, is one of the greatest blots on the system. They are also dissatisfied with the attitude taken up by many of the Boards of Poor Law Guardians in regard to the administration of outdoor relief. Outdoor relief is one of the few matters concerning which each board is allowed to determine its own policy.

The policy of the Local Government Board, the government department which controls all local administration in England and Wales, is to curtail outdoor relief as much as possible, but it is left to each Board of Guardians to decide whether it will refuse outdoor relief at its discretion in each indi-

vidual case which comes before it. Most Poor Law experts are with the Local Government Board in its desire that outdoor relief should be cut down to the lowest possible point, and in consequence many of the Boards of Guardians altogether refuse outdoor relief, and offer no alternative from the workhouse to all applicants. This is particularly the case in the London unions, in which the granting of outdoor relief has been brought down to as low a proportion as 20.2 of the total sum administered by the Metropolitan Poor Law Guardians. Last year this total was £912,276, of which £728,158 was represented by indoor relief—that is, relief in the workhouses, and £184,118 was paid out as doles to people who were living with or were partially supported by relatives and friends.

Poor Law reformers insist that this cutting down of outdoor relief has been pushed too far, and that in many instances a grant of two shillings and sixpence weekly from the Guardians, supplemented as it would be by the help of relatives, would save the rate-payers seven shillings and sixpence, and would also save many deserving old men and women who are past work from leaving their home and going into the workhouse.

There is also a feeling among some of the advocates of Poor Law reform that the law as it now stands is a little too harsh in its treatment of tramps and vagrants. They hold that the task which a tramp is compelled to perform before he leaves the casual ward after being afforded a night's lodging, detains him at work too far on into the day, and hinders his chance of getting permanent employment.

These are some of the objections which the Radicals urge against the Poor Law, as it is now administered under control of the Local Government Board, by the Boards of Guardians, in the 648 unions into which England and Wales are divided. They are also asking for reforms in the mode of electing Guardians. They complain that property is altogether too well represented on the Boards as now constituted, and would like to see an end to the system under which county magistrates are *ex-officio* members of the Boards for the unions in which they live, and also an end to the system of plural voting.

At present a ratepayer is allowed to vote in accordance with the amount of his assessment to the Poor Rates. The Radicals also object to the property qualification for a Poor Law Guardian. This is a matter largely in the hands of the Local Government Board, which fixes the qualification in each union. There is no uniformity in this matter. The Law sets out that the Board cannot require a qualification exceeding the annual value of £40. The Local Government Board settles the qualification in each union after consideration of the local circumstances and conditions, and thus it comes that the qualifications vary from £10 in one union to the maximum sum in another.

The Radicals desire a low uniform qualification, on the ground that as working men may become members of the House of Commons, and of city and county councils, there is no reason why they should not also become members of Poor Law Guardian Boards. The people who become chargeable on the Poor Rates are mostly of the laboring classes, and it is maintained by the Radicals that representatives of the working classes ought to have places on the Boards which deal with their cases.

When the County Government Bill of 1888 was in committee of the House of Commons there was a movement on the part of the Radicals to place the Poor Law administration in the hands of the new county councils

created by that measure. No success then attended the endeavor to make this transfer of power, but the attempt is likely to be renewed, now that the whole question of the administration of the Poor Law is to be inquired into by Royal Commission and later on dealt with by Parliament.

Poor Law experts have about half a dozen questions which they would like to have ventilated at the coming inquiry. Many experts are in favor of a total abandonment of the system under which outdoor relief is administered. Others would like to see some system devised which would enable a classification to be made of paupers in the workhouse. They admit the justice of the complaint of Poor Law reformers in regard to deserving old people who come upon the Poor Rates, but insist that at present there is no way out of the difficulty.

The vexed question of settlement will also be brought before the Commission. This question has been greatly narrowed and shorn of many of its difficulties since the Poor Law of 1834 first came into operation; but it still gives trouble occasionally, and in the case of contending unions calls for the intervention of the Local Government Board, and sometimes for that of the law courts. With a view to settling the question once and for all, some of the Poor Law specialists will advocate the abrogation of the law of settlement and the substitution of one under which all paupers shall become chargeable to the union in which they seek relief.

As the law now stands, twelve months' residence gives a man a settlement and prevents his being returned to the union in which he was born, as was the rule in the early days of the Poor Law. Under the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1851, the Local Government Board may determine questions of settlement arising between the Guardians of two Poor Law unions, and an order to this end made uuder the seal of the Local Government Board is in all courts and for all purposes final and conclusive. That cases of disputed settlement still occur is shown by the fact that in the year ending the 1st of July last, seven of these orders were issued by the Board, which in reporting the fact in its annual Blue Book expressed regret that Boards of Guardians do not more generally resort to this inexpensive mode of obtaining a decision in settlement cases, and thereby save the cost which litigation to the same end involves.

One other important question which Poor Law experts will submit to the Royal Commission is that affecting tramps. They are anxious that there should be uniformity of treatment of tramps and vagrants all over the country. They are not, as are the Radical Poor Law reformers, of the opinion that the tramp suffers any great hardship under the existing law. They hold that two-thirds of the tramps in England are worthless people, who would rather tramp the country than settle down permanently to work, and that in most unions the treatment accorded them is altogether too indulgent. Slackness in this matter in one union tells to the disadvantage of its neighboring unions, and for this reason Poor Law experts demand a more uniform treatment of tramps. They insist that these people belong to no particular union, but to the State, and that they can best be dealt with by an authority representing a much larger area than a Poor Law union. In London, with its thirty unions, the cost of feeding and sheltering tramps is borne by the whole metropolis, and defrayed out of a common fund.

Poor Law Guardians in the provinces who have given attention to the question are calling for a somewhat similar system outside London and

are urging that each county should have the care and defray the cost of relieving the tramps within its borders. Alien immigration has, within the last twelve months, greatly exercised Poor Law Guardians in the North of England, and it is quite possible, that, notwithstanding the attention which Lord Dunraven s Committee of the House of Lords gave to this question two or three years ago, the Poor Law phase of it may be again fully discussed before the Royal Commission.

EDWARD PORRITT.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXXVIII.

MAY, 1893.

THE BEHRING SEA QUESTION.

BY THE HON. B. F. TRACY, EX-SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

THE islands of St. Paul and St. George in Behring Sea, known as the Pribyloff Islands, were transferred to the United States by Russia in 1867 as part of the Alaska purchase. These two islands are the only places inhabited by the seal in Alaskan territory. Across Behring Sea,* near the Siberian coast, and distant seven hundred and fifty miles due west from the Pribyloff Islands, is another group known as the Commander Islands, belonging to Russia, which are also inhabited by seal. No other seal-colony of any size exists in the North Pacific. The two herds inhabiting these two widely-separated groups of islands, one American, the other Russian, never mingle with each other, either on the islands which form their respective habitations, or in the adjacent waters, but each herd maintains and has always maintained its separate and distinct existence. There is no record of the killing of a seal belonging to the Commander Islands upon the isles of Pribyloff. The members of the two herds are readily distinguished by their skins, that of the American seal being of a higher quality and worth about twenty-per cent. more in the market. The difference is well established and fully recognized, although its cause has never been ascertained. It may be due to the variations of climate, to a difference in the tempera-

* So named from Vitus Bering or Behring, who discovered it in 1728.

Copyright, 1893, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

ture of the neighboring waters, to some peculiarity in food, or to all these combined, but whatever the causes they must have operated for generations to produce the marked difference in the animals, which is conclusive evidence of the absolute separation of the two herds, and serves to identify the members of each herd beyond the possibility of question.

Why the American seal should have selected these two remote islands in the waters of Alaska for its home, *and no others,* cannot be positively stated. Delighting in fog, but unable to endure either ice or sun, the animals have doubtless been influenced in their choice by the fact that the islands are almost continously enveloped in fog from May to November ; that they are free from ice during the breeding season ; that a large portion of their surface is covered by ledges of smooth, bare rock, and that their shores consist of gentle slopes, giving easy access from the water, and making a beach on which the young seal can live while learning to swim. Whatever the reasons, the fact is established that these two islands are the only home of the American seal in these waters, that it has never been known to breed on any other land, and that it occupies them for about eight months each year.

The fur seal is *sui generis.* It is a warm-blooded, fur-bearing, highly-organized animal, classified by naturalists with bears, dogs, cats and other carnivorous mammals. It is essentially a land animal. It can and does at times live in the water, but it is not a fish and has none of the characteristics of the fish. Among fishes it is most nearly allied to the whale, which also belongs to the family of mammalia ; but unlike the whale, which is begotten, born and reared in the water, and which perishes when removed from its native element, the seal is begotten, born and reared on the land, and but for its life on the land the species would become extinct. This period of land habitation lasts from six to eight months continuously. During this time the seals only visit the sea for short periods, for food. Some of them do not leave the island at all, even for this purpose, and if a lagoon existed, or a tank could be built that would hold enough fish to supply their wants they would not need to go to sea at all. The seal may, therefore, be accurately described as a land animal whose food is found in the sea.

The breeding season of the seal is in summer. The animals are then at their home on the islands. Here procreation takes

place. The period of gestation is between eleven and twelve months, during the second half of which the herds are at sea. The approach of its completion finds the mothers again returning to the islands ready to give birth to their young as soon as they reach their summer home. Shortly after the birth and while they are still nursing their off-spring, they again become pregnant with the young that will be born in the following season, and this process of reproduction is repeated year after year with unvarying regularity.

During the winter months the seal of the Pribyloff Islands, male and female, old and young, make an annual excursion into the North Pacific Ocean south of Behring Sea, and from this point they disperse widely to the south and east. The extent of this annual dispersion is not known, nor do we know its cause. What we do know is that it takes place each winter and lasts until the late spring. When this time arrives the scattered animals, by a natural and invariable instinct, converge from all directions, and gathering in one vast herd in the waters of the North Pacific south of the Aleutian Islands pass through the straits between those islands, and make their way together to the Pribyloffs. In this annual return of the herds to the northward, the older bulls assume the lead, and reach the islands about May 5th. As they arrive they choose their positions on the rookeries, and there await the coming of their mates. The cows, heavy with young, follow them closely, the first arriving about June 10th; and by the fifteenth of the following month the entire herd has again assembled on the islands.

In company with the well-grown bulls and cows come the younger animals, the product of the herd during the past six years. The males do not reach maturity until six or seven years of age, and these young males, together with the yearling females, take up their abode by themselves on what are known as the "hauling grounds," quite apart from the rookeries, or breeding places. None of these young males are allowed by their elders to come upon the rookeries until they are fully matured, and not even then, unless they may be able to overcome in single combat some old bull whose fighting powers have been weakened by age. They must conquer their places, and with all alike, old and young, the warfare of the rookeries means the survival of the fittest.

The young are dropped soon after the mother reaches the land, sometimes within a few hours, sometimes after one or two days. As soon as this is accomplished the mother passes immediately into heat and again becomes pregnant. For about four months after birth the young seal is nursed, receiving during this time nothing but its mother's milk, which it takes once every two or three days. All this time it remains wholly on the land. It is curious and significant that the young seal is not a natural swimmer, and that if thrown into the water on its early visits to the beach it will drown—a strong confirmation of the fact that it is by nature a land animal. When about two months old it goes down to the shore and plays in the surf, gradually learning to swim. At four months it has progressed so far that it can go in pursuit of food, but even then, and for a considerable time after, it is a clumsy swimmer.

Except the full-grown bulls, which can go without food for a long period, and the nursing young, all the seals feed in the sea during their residence on the land. Every two or three days they make a brief excursion into the waters in search of food. It is a perpetual coming and going. How far these excursions extend is not definitely known. But as the seals, after a year or two of experience, can swim easily from ten to twelve miles an hour, and as it is known that the mother seal is often away from one to two days, it is certain that they swim off as far as a hundred miles from the islands in search of food. Apart from the inherent difficulty of finding enough to sustain the life of a million animals in a zone of twenty-five to thirty miles from the islands, the fact of these long excursions is susceptible of proof. A correspondent of the *New York Herald*, writing from one of the poaching vessels last summer, states that a mother seal was killed more than a hundred miles from the islands, and her udder was found full of milk. Compelled to find food not only for themselves, but to meet the extra drain made upon them in nourishing their young, the mothers go into the sea far more frequently than the other members of the herd, and are therefore much more exposed to the attacks of poachers.

The seal rookeries on the islands of St. George and St. Paul are the largest in the world. Here the business of breeding, raising to maturity, selecting the male seals for slaughter at the age and season when the fur is of the most value ; of curing, pre-

serving, shipping and marketing the skins has been carried on for nearly ninety years. It was founded by the Russians in 1804, and was carried on by them until 1867, when the islands, together with the business, were transferred to the United States as part of the Alaskan purchase, for which the latter government paid the sum of seven million dollars. This government soon after the transfer, in the exercise of its rights as owner, assumed by an express statute the control and conduct of the business. By this statute the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prescribe the number, age and sex of the seals that may be slaughtered. During all this time the business has been carried on in substantially the same manner as any other successful breeding establishment. The methods in use on the Pribyloff Islands are almost identical with those of the ranchmen upon our Western plains. On the ranch the cattle roam at will, finding food where best they may until the annual round-up, when the ranchman selects from the herd those which he desires to market, retaining such as are necessary for the increase of the herd, or for continued growth and profit. At the annual round-up of the seals, which lasts from June to October, the young males of from two to five years of age which are still immature for purposes of breeding, and hence known as bachelors, are selected for slaughter. At this age, though useless for procreation, their fur has reached its highest quality, and brings the highest price in the market. During part of the months of August and September, however, the fur temporarily loses its best quality, and no seals are slaughtered.

No females are allowed to be killed on the islands. All are preserved for the increase of the herd, for it is upon the number of females that this increase mainly depends. The cow bears but one calf a year, while the bull, as a rule, serves as many as fifteen cows in a season, and may serve twenty or thirty. For keeping up the numbers of the herd, therefore, one male suffices for at least fifteen females. The killing of a single female means the cutting off of one young seal a year from the natural increase of the herd during the natural term of the mother's life. The killing of fourteen out of every fifteen males would involve no diminution whatever of the annual increase.

In selecting animals for the market, the men employed on the work go among the bachelor seals and, choosing the proper number from the great body that lie huddled together upon the

hauling-grounds, drive them to the place where they are to be slaughtered. They are killed in the open field with clubs, and the thousands of their companions in the immediate presence of whom the work is done, make no effort to escape or run away. The United States could, in this way, destroy in a single season every one of the seals on the island.

The seal industry gives employment on the islands to about one hundred men, the permanent population entirely dependent upon it for support consisting of from fifty to sixty families. To supply them with fresh meat, the Secretary of the Treasury permits the slaughter of not exceeding five thousand young seals yearly. The business thus conducted by the United States is a source of great profit. Its successful prosecution requires large capital, great energy, and skill. If the seal herds can be preserved for the next century under the conditions that existed down to 1885, it is a low estimate to place the value of these two islands at thirty millions of dollars. With the seal exterminated, they are of no value whatever.

During all these successive summers, in which, for ninety years, the business has been prosecuted, the seal has fed in the sea, and it has been permitted to come and go without let or hindrance. No substantial interference with the industry occurred prior to 1886, when a few Canadian poachers for the first time openly entered Behring Sea for the purpose of hunting the seal found in the waters surrounding the islands. This practice has continued ever since with steadily-increasing activity. The poachers respect neither age nor sex, slaughtering alike male and female, young and old. As the breeding bulls do not leave the islands, it is upon the females that this indiscriminate killing tells most heavily. The death of each mother means the extinction of three lives, her own and those of the new-born calf awaiting her return on the island, and of the unborn offspring which has only lately been conceived. Thousands of the calves die annually because their mothers are ruthlessly slaughtered while searching for food that is to give them strength to nurse their young. It is a yearly-recurring massacre of mothers and their little ones, for the commercial profit of the poachers, and it is rendered tenfold more fatal to seal life by the method in which it is pursued. For it must be remembered that these seals are killed not by clubbing, or harpooning, or catching with a

hook, but by the simple process of shooting them as they are seen at the surface of the water. Hence vast numbers of those shot are lost, and the number taken represents but a small part of the number killed. The enormous destruction of seal life that results from this barbarous and reckless practice can only be guessed at. If the number taken by the poachers can reach over twenty-eight thousand, as it did in 1891, what must be the number of those that were killed and left behind? It is said that they lose five out of every six shot. The depredations of 1886 and the following years reduced the number allowed by the lease to be killed on the island from a hundred thousand to sixty thousand, and of this number only twenty-one thousand could be killed in 1890. Already we are advised that sixty-seven vessels are ready to engage in their unlawful work during the coming season, as against forty-nine last year. Unless this poaching can be suppressed the extermination of the seal at an early date is certain.

It is obvious that the United States has an immense interest at stake in the future of the fur seal. It is obvious, also, that the preservation of the species is an interest in which not only the United States, but all mankind, are directly concerned. But the question we are now considering is not one of interest; it is solely a question of right, and it should be approached impartially with the single object of determining with certainty what are the rights of the parties in the matter. The questions to be considered, are:

First—What right of property has the United States in the fur seal of the Alaskan Islands?

Secondly: In what way and to what extent can this property right be protected and enforced.

There can be no question that the seals while on the Pribyloff Islands are the property of the United States. The law of nature fixes an inchoate property in all animals *ferœ naturæ* in the owner of the territories where they are found. The right is said to exist *ratione soli*—the owner of the soil is the owner of the animal. This principle found expression in the Roman law, which, although it held in general that wild beasts are the property of the taker, allowed no man to hunt upon another's ground, except by consent of the owner of the soil. It found similar expression in the Danish law of England, which was traced directly

to the Scandinavian law of the Continent, and which gave to the owner of the land the exclusive right to take wild animals thereon. The same rule was adopted in the Saxon laws that preceded the Conquest, and such would appear likewise to have been the doctrine of the common law.

We have spoken of this as an inchoate right because, although it was exclusive enough on the territory, the nomadic habits of wild animals gave it a merely transitory character, unless, in some way, the ownership was asserted. An animal that wandered hither and thither, having no fixed connection with the locality, now on one man's land and now on that of another, equally incapable of identification on either, could only be said to be owned at the moment when it was caught and killed, for its ownership depended upon the place where at this moment it happened to be. Some further element was necessary to vest a complete title to the animals while still living, and to separate either in principle or in fact the wild beasts which roamed at large in the forest from those which the proprietor of the land could claim as the subject of a fixed and well-defined property right.

This additional element was found in the idea of reduction to possession, which, when united to the inchoate right vested, *ratione soli*, in the proprietor of the land, gave a complete title. The reduction to possession took an infinite variety of forms. It might arise from the grant of the sovereign, from the act of the lord of the soil, or finally from the act of nature. Thus under the game laws so long in force in England, the crown granted to individuals certain franchises or rights of hunting known under the name of chase, park, free warren, etc. Here it was the act of the sovereign. Again, it might arise from a man's own act, as by making an inclosure and confining the animals within it, as deer in a park, pheasants or partridges in a mew, or hares or rabbits in a warren; or by employing keepers, to whom the animals were a direct and peculiar charge. In fact, actual confinement, by an inclosure, or otherwise, was not necessary to establish this reduction to possession, by which ownership was rendered complete. Thus doves or pigeons, living in a dovecote on the land, were held to be reduced to possession, although free to go and come and to fly hither and thither as they pleased. In this case mere residence or having an abode on the land was a sufficient reduction to possession. In the same way bees, although

rightly classed by jurists as animals *feræ naturæ* have for hundreds of years been regarded as the property of him upon whose land they are hived, to be sold and transferred by delivery like the horse or the ox; and this, solely because their home is fixed upon his territory. The bees, like the doves and pigeons, are free to wander in search of flowers to feed on, but are none the less reduced to possession, so as to be, to the fullest extent, the subject of property. The same may be said of the hawks, formerly used in the sport of falconry.

In determining what constituted possession, the law in many cases gave effect to what was, in reality, little more than a bare assertion of ownership. As in the case of the deer, mentioned by Blackstone, "that is chased out of my park or forest and instantly pursued by the keeper or forester," these remain "still in my possession, and I still preserve my qualified property in them." In some cases the act of reduction was merely symbolical, as by putting on a mark, like the delivery of a twig or a clod of earth which constituted livery of seisin or possession at common law. Thus Blackstone says:

> "If a deer, or any wild animal reclaimed, hath a collar or other mark put upon him, and goes and returns at his pleasure; or if a wild swan is taken and marked and turned loose in the river, the owner's property in him still continues, and it is not lawful for any one else to take him."

So far have the courts carried the principle of what may be called constructive reduction to possession that, in a case cited by Chitty, an action was maintained against one who by firing guns near the decoy-pond of another, frightened away the wild fowl resorting there. In this case the wild fowl, for whose loss the owner of the land could sue, had not been captured; they had not even been brought within the actual power of the plaintiff. They were merely in such a situation that their actions indicated that they might or would, if not interfered with, come eventually into his power; and this bare potential possession was sufficient to enable him to maintain an action.

But the law does not stop with the acts of the sovereign or of the private land-owner. It infers a reduction to possession from the unaided act of nature. Thus in the case of animals, however wild, the law gave the owner of the soil a clear property title to the young born thereon until such time as they were able to fly or run away. It was not necessary to capture them, or in any way to

lay hands upon them. *It was enough that the owner could capture them if he desired.* The law looked not to actual possession, but to the power of reducing to possession at will. Upon similar principles the Supreme Court of the State of New York has held that bodily seizure is not requisite, but it is sufficient that the animal should be brought within the certain control of the party.

Nor is it necessary, in cases where the reduction to possession is brought about by the unaided act of nature, that the animal should lose his freedom of movement, or that his going and coming should be restricted any more than it is in cases where possession arises from the intervention of man. If a colony of bees swarm upon a hollow tree on my land, making its home therein, the law without question recognizes those bees as my property. No barriers encircle them; they are free to go and come as they choose. I have done nothing to restrain them; I have not even done aught to invite them. Yet they are as completely mine as if I had built a hive for them. They found on my land a congenial dwelling which nature placed there, and by taking up their abode therein they have reduced themselves to my possession and thus become my property by their own act.

The principle that a reduction to possession, with all its attendant consequences, may be established by the acquisition through the animal's voluntary act of a home on the land, has received a clear enunciation from the highest English authorities. In a masterly opinion delivered in the Court of Exchequer (Blades v. Higgs, 13 C. B. 850) Baron Wilde says:

"It has been argued that an animal *feræ naturæ* could not be the subject of individual property. But this is not so; for the common law affirms a right of property in animals even though they were *feræ naturæ*, if they were restrained either *by habit* or inclosure within the lands of the owner. We have the authority of Lord Coke's reports for this right in respect to wild animals, such as hawks, deer, and game, if reclaimed, or swans or fish, if kept in a private moat or pond, or doves in a dove-cote.

"The principle of the common law seems, therefore, to be a very reasonable one; for, in cases where either *their own induced habits*, or the confinement imposed by man, *have brought about, in the existence of wild animals, the character of fixed abode in a particular locality*, the law does not refuse to recognize in the owner of the land which sustained them a property co-extensive with that state of things."

Having established this clear principle that the inchoate right to wild animals, however wild they may be, vests in the owner of the land on which they are found *ratione soli*, and that the re-

duction to possession completes and perfects this title, how does the principle apply to the case of the seal? Although doubtless to be classed, like the bees, as animals *feræ naturæ*, the wildness of the seal is by no means that of a beast of prey that roams in the forest. In the strict sense a wild animal is one that fears man and instinctively seeks to escape from his presence. But the seal is born tame. On the land he is docile and helpless, having neither the desire nor the ability to escape from the control of man. It might well be claimed that with an animal having such a disposition no formal reduction to possession is necessary. But assuming that it is, the conditions surrounding the life of the animals upon the Pribyloff Islands are such as to establish it in the amplest manner, both by the act of nature and by the act of man. In the first place the seal is begotten and born upon the islands, and during the first four months of its life, while it is being reared, it cannot get away. Possession at this time exists in the strictest sense of the term, and may be said to vest a complete title. But, apart from the case of the young seal, the condition of the whole herd, young and old alike, is such that they are substantially as much reduced to possession as domestic animals. The islands are their home, their fixed place of abode, which they inhabit during the greater part of the year, and to which they have always returned during a period whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. They live and abide there, as the bees and the doves, however much they may wander, live and abide upon the land to which they always return from their flights. It matters not that this abode has been selected by the animal's unaided instinct, and that it is maintained by his voluntary habits. We are told, and truly, that the adoption of a fixed abode, although the result of mere habit, constitutes such a reduction to possession as to establish firmly a property right. We have seen a complete illustration of this principle in the case of the bees, which, having swarmed on a tree on a man's land, become *ipso facto* his property. And this adoption of an abode is not a novel and recent movement of the present generation of seals, not the sudden impulse or caprice of the moment, but the act of ancient progenitors, repeated year after year by their descendants, from the first time that their habits were observed and recorded. It has been their ancestral home from time immemorial.

It must be noted also that this is the only abode of the seal. They never take up even a temporary residence in the territory of another. If they did it could hardly be regarded as a home, when compared with the Pribyloffs, the seat of reproduction, the birthplace of the race; but they do not. During the summer the mothers and the half-grown seal leave the islands only for short excursions to obtain food. The adult bulls and the pups do not leave them at all. In the winter the herds go out into the ocean, which is no man's territory. There is no other land, domestic or foreign, which the seal visit even for purposes of casual sojourn; much less is there any which can set up a rival claim as their fixed abode.

But it is not alone by the act of nature that the seal on the Pribyloffs have been reduced to possession. While here they are in the direct charge and under the certain control of the keepers on the islands. The control of these keepers, and through them, of the proprietor of the soil, is complete. No one would deny that if the herd were walled up in an inclosure, or if the animals were tied individually with rope, they would be reduced to possession. But so restricted are their powers of locomotion that, if these measures were adopted, control would not thereby be rendered more perfect. When driven by their keepers they move slowly and with painful effort. In comparative facility of capture the bee and the dove are as illusive as quicksilver. To have a herd of animals under your certain power and control it is not necessary to tie them up, when their greatest possible power of movement will carry them only one step to your ten, and when they are so tame that at your approach not one among the thousands moves from his place until you drive him away by force. This is no mere constructive reduction to possession, but a certain, actual and efficient reduction to possession.

The question what shall constitute property in wild animals within the territory has so far been considered solely as it arises between individuals, — that is to say, between the individual owners of different parcels of land upon which such animals may be found, or between one individual land-owner and the captor of the animals. But the question takes a much broader scope when considered as a question between state and state. What shall constitute ownership within the territory of a state as against another state? Is any reduction to possession necessary to com-

plete the property right of the state within its territory? And, if so, what constitutes a reduction to possession? This question is one which it is entirely competent for every sovereign to decide upon his own territory, and within his own jurisdiction. The property of the sovereign in wild animals within the territory has been repeatedly recognized and has found frequent expression in legislation. Thus the English game laws, which were adopted after the Conquest, held that all animals of chase, and such as were accounted game, belonged to the king, who granted the right to take them to such of his subjects as he might choose. The right of the sovereign to vest in individuals a title to wild animals is affirmed with distinctness by Baron Wilde, of the Court of Exchequer, in the English case quoted above. In commenting unfavorably upon certain decisions of English courts, which showed a departure from the original doctrine of the common law, he says: "If the *legislature* should interfere by giving to the owner of land a property in game, either absolute or qualified, as long as it remained on his land, it would only be acting in the spirit and policy of the common law." In fact, the examples of this exercise of the sovereign power both in England and the United States are numerous. Thus the Legislature of the State of New York has enlarged the power of acquiring a title to game by pursuit, in the case of deer in the counties of Suffolk and Queens, by declaring that any person that starts a pursuit of such game shall be deemed in possession of the same so long as he continues in fresh pursuit thereof. Nothing could be a clearer assertion of the right of the sovereign to declare what acts in the nature of a reduction to possession may be necessary in order that the title may vest.

Now, the property right in the seal is claimed not by the owner of the soil alone, in virtue of his ownership, nor by the sovereign of the territory alone, in virtue of his eminent domain. It is claimed by him who is at the same time owner and sovereign. The two titles meet in the United States. The United States, as sovereign of the territory, has reduced to possession the wild animals on its domain. The United States, as owner of the soil, has reduced to possession the wild animals on the land which it holds in fee. Can anything further be wanted to establish its title to these animals on the islands?

Although it might seem under these circumstances that no declaration or enactment would be necessary on the part of the

sovereign to establish his title, yet this is not wanting. Not only have the seal been reduced to possession and so clothed with the character of property, by the act of nature, and the act of man, but they have been expressly declared by the sovereign power to be its property. The Russian Government, the original proprietor of the seal, affirmed distinctly its rights of ownership, founded thereon a charter to a particular company, and prohibited to all other parties the exercise of such rights as ownership implies. The United States succeeded by purchase to the right of the Russian Government, and, lest there should be any misconception upon the point, it confirmed the declaration of its predecessor by an express statute. This statute, passed July 27, 1868, provides that "no person shall kill any otter, mink, marten, sable or *fur seal*, or other fur-bearing animal within the limits of Alaska territory, or in the waters thereof."

By the act of July 1, 1870 [*Rev. Stat. Sec.* 1960], it is provided that it shall be unlawful to kill any fur seal upon the islands of St. George and St. Paul, or in the waters adjacent thereto, except during the months of June, July, September and October in each year; and it shall be unlawful to kill such seals at any time by the use of fire arms, or by other means tending to drive the seals away from those islands; but the keepers on the islands are allowed the privilege of killing such seals as may be necessary for their own food, clothing and boats. It is also [*Sec.* 1961] made unlawful to kill any female seal, or any seal less than one year old, at any season of the year, in the waters adjacent to the islands, and the penalties of fine and imprisonment and forfeiture of vessels and cargoes are imposed for violation of the act.

The statute proceeds [*Sec.* 1962] to limit the number of seals to be killed for their skins upon the islands to 100,000 per annum for a period of twenty years, and empowers the Secretary of the Treasury to reduce the limit, if it become necessary for the preservation of the seals; to make leases of the right of taking fur seals on the islands; and, finally (*Sec.* 1967), every person who kills any fur seal on either of these islands, or in the waters adjacent thereto, without the authority of the lessees thereof, or who molests, disturbs or interferes with the lessees in the lawful prosecution of their business shall be subject to fine and imprisonment, and a forfeiture of their vessels and cargoes.

In pursuance of these statutes, the United States has granted

by successive leases the right of taking seal from the islands; and it has thus in every possible way asserted and confirmed by acts and by express declarations the property right which it acquired in the Pribyloff seal when it became the proprietor of the islands upon which they dwell.

Having established the property right in the seal while on the land, the question is: When the animals leave the islands how far does this ownership continue? Upon this point a clear exposition of the law has been given by Blackstone, the greatest English authority upon the common law. Speaking of animals *feræ naturæ*, which, like the seal have once been reduced to possession, he says:

"These are no longer the property of man than while they continue in his keeping or actual possession; but if at any time they regain their natural liberty his property instantly ceases; *unless they have animum revertendi, which is to be known only by their usual custom of returning.* The law therefore extends this proposition *further than to the mere manual occupation.*"

Upon this principle it is clear that even an animal *feræ naturæ* may leave the immediate keeping or possession of his owner, and the land which is his permanent abiding place, and if he has the intention of returning, as shown by his usual custom, his owner's title to him remains unchanged, and may be asserted against others who seek to capture him. Such a capture is unlawful, and the property may be reclaimed from the captor wherever it can be identified. If my bees, which, be it remembered, are *feræ naturæ*, fly into my neighbor's orchard, and feed there, intending to return, he has no right to treat them as his own. My neighbor has no more title to them than he has to my horse or my ox that is found trespassing upon his land. Still less can capture be justified or a title by capture be asserted where the bees fly into the highway, which is for the common use of all. As with the bees, so with hawks and doves. It is not necessary to my ownership that I should restrain their freedom of movement, a freedom which from the habits of the animal is indispensable to their existence; it is not necessary that I should pursue them in their daily excursions, for their movements are in accordance with their nature, and I know they will return. The *animus revertendi* continues my possession, and preserves my

title; and I can maintain this title whenever and wherever I can identify my property. It makes no difference whether the intention to return springs from instinct, as in the case of the bee, or from partial domestication, as in the case of the dove. A carrier pigeon, thrown up five hundred miles away from its home, does not become the property of any person who may capture it during the course of its homeward flight; although liberated it is not abandoned. The owner has set it free knowing that its instinct would with unerring certainty lead it home again. The bird is doing the work for which nature has intended it, and no one would have the right to capture it, or to interfere with its movements.

Such being the principle of law in reference to animals that are compelled by their nature and habits to make excursions from their home, how does it apply to the case of the seal? Like the bees, they are wild animals, but like the bees, also, they are the subject of property. While on the Pribyloff Islands they are unquestionably the property of the United States. These islands have been for ages their fixed place of abode, where generation after generation has been begotten, born and reared, where the greater part of each year has been spent, and to which all have returned season after season with unbroken uniformity. Upon these islands they are under the complete and effective control and possession of their keepers. Their owner does not confine them there, any more than the owner of the bees, or the hawks, or the doves, because in the one case, as in the other, confinement is neither desirable nor necessary. It is not desirable because in all these cases the animal's habits and mode of life require freedom of movement. It is unnecessary because, when the seals journey forth, they are sure to come back. When they leave, they leave with the fixed intention of returning. Does anyone suppose that the mother which has gone out for food, that she may nurse her young, will forget her maternal instinct and wander off, leaving her little one to die of starvation? Is there any possibility that she will fail to return, unless indeed she falls a victim to the poachers, who have formed a cordon about the islands that they may steal her skin?

Even in the annual migration, when all the seals depart and are absent for four or five months, they have the same intention of returning, of which the best evidence is their actual return year after year for more than a hundred years, when the proper

season comes. And upon this migration, it is not to another home that they resort. They land upon no foreign territory, even temporarily. Like the bees, that fly into the highway, their wanderings are in the open ocean, the highway of all nations. Like the bees also they go with the intention of returning. Wherever the Alaskan seal may wander from his home, the *animus revertendi* is always present with him.

We need go no further than to ask that the strict principle of the common law be applied in the case of the seal as in that of other animals. We have seen how such animals are regarded when they go out for food or for any other object. The birds and the bees are the private property of individuals, and while their home is upon the land they may, and in fact do, live for a large part of the time in the air. Does not the same right of property exist in a land animal that lives and fixes its home upon the owner's soil, but hunts its food in the water? Is the freedom of the sea less than the freedom of the air? "The hawk that chases his quarry," says Blackstone, "remains mine wherever he flies, because he is sure to return." My seal, leaving my land to chase his quarry, is not less mine than the hawk, since it is equally certain that he will return.

Nor will it be denied, in the face of the well-established doctrine of law, which has been quoted above, that if a mark were put upon each seal it would, like the wild swan, continue "the owner's property," and it would be unlawful for anyone else to take the animal, as long as the owner can reclaim it. But here again nature has done the work for man. No brand is needed to identify the seal of the Pribyloff Islands, nor would any "collar or other mark" fix more distinctly his membership in the American herd, or his home on the American islands, than these have been already fixed by his skin, and by the fact that his movements are confined during fixed times to fixed localities which no other animals of the same species frequent. No seal but the seal of the Pribyloff makes its way up through the Aleutian passes in the spring; no other fills the waters in the hundred-mile zone about the islands during the summer, and no other again passes down through the straits in the autumn.

Lord Salisbury has undertaken to dispute the property right of the United States in the seal, on the ground that such a right cannot be acquired in wild animals unless they are actually the

subject of capture. He states his theory in his letter of May 22, 1890, in the following terms :

> "Fur seals are undisputably animals *feræ naturæ*, and these have been universally regarded by jurists as *res nullius*, until they are caught; no person, therefore, can have property in them until he has actually reduced them to possession by capture."

This sweeping dictum of Lord Salisbury fails entirely to take account of the simple and clear distinctions of the common law, as well as of the character and habits of the animal whose relations he is discussing. It is in direct contradiction not only of reason but of authority and example. By making capture the sole and exclusive test of property in animals *feræ naturæ* it would do away with the title of the United States to the seal upon its own land, until each seal had been tied with a rope or knocked on the head with a club. Even the rights of property as between individuals are not to be governed by such a rule, much less the rights arising between nation and nation. And it must be remembered that the present question is of the latter kind. The sovereign is under no necessity, in order to create title to wild animals on his land, of reducing them to possession by capture even when they are nomadic and predatory in their habits, and only temporarily therein. Still less is his title dependent upon capture when they have a fixed habitation on his land. They need no reduction to possession, for they are reduced to possession already.

Could any formal act of capture put the seal on the Pribyloffs more completely under the possession of the United States than they are to-day ? Does it make any difference in their condition that this possession results from the voluntary act of the animals themselves ? An animal that has walked into an inclosure of its own accord is no less captured than an animal which has been driven in by main force. A capture is none the less a capture because it takes the form of a voluntary surrender.

Nor does it make any difference that this water-locked territory upon which the animals have thus voluntarily put themselves in the power of their keepers was formed for its purpose by nature. It is an inherent element in the value of the property which the United States acquired by purchase, that it has such natural advantages as a refuge for the seal that it could not, in

this respect, be improved by the art of man. It is one of the attributes and incidents of our property, to the benefits of which we are as much entitled as if we had ourselves constructed the shelving beaches, the rookeries filled with smooth rocks, and the hauling grounds where the young seal are herded. If I make a trap for any kind of untamed beast or bird, and put therein objects that will attract them, and they fall into it, they are mine even by Lord Salisbury's ruling. Are they any the less mine if nature has constructed a trap upon my own ground, and provided it with sources of attraction? Nobody can deny that the Pribyloff group is as perfect a means of reducing the seal to possession by capture as any which the hand of man could have constructed. In fact it is far more perfect, and the proof of it lies in the fact that each year the seal returns to be taken, with never-failing persistency, and that at any time during any summer its owners could, without an effort, annihilate the herd,—not only as it exists to-day, but for all future time.

It may be said in passing that this annihilation of the seal herd is not only possible, but may become necessary, should any such theory as that of Lord Salisbury be applied to the Alaskan seal, and thereby serve to defeat the right of the United States to protect its property. If it becomes a question between the extinction of the herd for the benefit of its owners, and the extinction of the herd for the benefit of foreign poachers, the United States will have no choice but to adopt the former alternative. It certainly does not propose to protect seal life simply in order that poachers may do all the killing, and it cannot be expected to debar itself and its citizens from a legitimate means of support arising within its own jurisdiction, upon considerations of the general welfare, when the predatory acts of others, in defiance of all such considerations, are cutting off the source of this revenue and appropriating the proceeds to themselves.

The adoption of Lord Salisbury's theory can hardly fail, therefore, to lead to the extinction of the species. It is probable, however, that Lord Salisbury did not intend to apply his principle to the ownership of wild animals on the territory, although he states it broadly and without any limitations.

The forms of animal life to which, and to which alone, the doctrine really applies, are those of fish in the sea, of migratory birds in the air, and of such nomadic wild animals on land as

wander from one state to another. These have no fixed habitation. Such of them as seek out a temporary resting place and sojourn there for limited periods lose their identity the moment they leave it. In some rare cases it is possible that animals may return at intervals to these favorite places of sojourn, but if they do there is no way by which the fact can be established, or by which those following such a practice can be distinguished from the great body of migratory animals of the same species. With all such, therefore, when outside of the jurisdiction of any particular nation, capture is the general test of ownership.

The Alaskan seal cannot be confounded with the animals above described. It resembles them in no respect. Until the herd separates, south of the Aleutian Islands, it never loses its identity, and it retains always its territorial domicile. When it leaves the Alaskan Islands, it goes only into the ocean. It goes with the intention of returning, and this intention it has carried out year after year as far back as its history is known. It is in this intention of returning that lies, according to Blackstone, the essence of continuing ownership after the animal has left the territory of its owner. It obviates the necessity of capture, or, rather, it is in itself a capture. Lord Salisbury would not dispute the position that a fish on a hook at the end of a line was the qualified property of the owner of the line, even though the line were as long as the trans-Atlantic cable, and though the ultimate landing of the fish might be subject to many chances and uncertainties. The *animus revertendi*, recurring year after year in the same manner with unchanging regularity, as it has recurred for an indefinite period in the past, is a force less resistible than that which operates through hook and line, and gives a greater certainty of ultimate capture.

It having been shown that the United States has a property in the seal, not only on land but in the sea, the second question that arises is: In what way, and to what extent can this property right be protected and enforced?

Here again we may take the law from the great commentator whom we have previously quoted:

"In reference to animals *feræ naturæ*," he says, "while they thus continue my qualified or defeasible property, they are as much under the protection of the law as if they were absolutely and indefeasibly mine, and an action will lie against any man that detains them from me or unlawfully

destroys them. It is also as much felony by common law to steal such of them as are fit for food as it is to steal tame animals, but not so if they are only kept for pleasure, curiosity, or whim, as dogs, bears, cats, apes, parrots, and singing birds, because their value is not intrinsic, but depending only on the caprice of the owner, though it is such an invasion of property as may amount to a civil injury and be redressed by a civil action."

Although this distinction between animals having an intrinsic value and those kept merely as pets has passed away in recent times, yet even by Blackstone's standard of intrinsic value the taking of a seal in which another had a property right would have amounted to felony.

The property right of the United States in the seal rests upon the broad principle than an animal, even *feræ naturæ*, which has once been reduced to possession, and which leaves its home with the intention of returning, retains its character of property and may be reclaimed by its owner wherever it can be identified. Whether international law affords a process by which this right could be enforced within the jurisdiction of another party, it is not necessary to consider, for the seal are not found within the jurisdiction of another. They go only into the sea; and the sea is nothing more than a great common or waste—the property of no man, but which all alike are free to use. It is in this great unoccupied and unowned territory that the seals which are our property and have their home upon our land can alone find a means of sustenance. Shall they be debarred from its use by the predatory acts of another?

The right which I possess of feeding my animals in the sea is in the ordinary nature of a usufruct; a right to enjoy the benefits of property that is not one's own. The United States does not own the sea, for the sea is no man's property, but it claims a usufruct in the sea, at least as great as that of every other nation. If a stream of water flows through my land, I do not own the water, but I am entitled to the usufruct of the water. I cannot divert the stream from its bed, which would inflict damage upon another, but I can use it for domestic purposes, and can cause my cattle to be watered in it, and I can employ its current to obtain power to turn my mill. So when I have an animal that is my undoubted property, and whose nature requires that at certain periods it shall use the sea to obtain its necessary sustenance, I can claim for that animal so situated that in its enjoyment of the sea, or what is the same thing, in my lawful enjoyment of it

by feeding my animal therein, I shall not be interrupted or injured by others.

Suppose that the fur seal lived on the Pribyloff Islands during the whole year instead of during eight months; would anybody claim that in making their brief diurnal or weekly excursion in pursuit of food they had not the right to obtain their food without molestation? If my ducks are found in the water, in search of fish or other food, can anyone take them? If my dog or my horse should swim out to sea, or being on a wrecked vessel should swim to shore, anyone who injured or molested him in the water would be answerable to me for the damage he had done, and my right to indemnity would be the same, even though the wrong-doer were a foreign subject, and the wrong done was done outside the three-mile limit. In the same way, when my seal has swum out into the water to obtain food in obedience to a natural instinct, I can claim that he shall not be injured, or molested, during his brief absence from the only place which he knows as home. Being my property upon the land, he is mine also when in the sea. The title does not shift every time he goes into and returns from it.

The right to prevent such an injury as between state and state has nothing to do with the limitations of maritime jurisdiction. It depends upon a law of far greater force and higher origin than any doctrine of territorial jurisdiction—the law of self-preservation. The right of self-preservation is the highest right known to man. In an individual it is synonymous with the right of existence; in a nation it is a right to preserve and protect its property and the lives and property of its citizens wherever they may be.

This right of protecting the seal is no question of closed seas or open seas; of free navigation, or obstructed navigation. The sea is no one's property—the open highway of every nation, whose ships may freely navigate it for the purpose of lawful trade. The United States does not claim to obstruct such navigation, in waters either within or outside its territorial jurisdiction. It does not assert that Behring Sea or any other part of the ocean is a closed sea, for any lawful purpose, but it does assert that the privilege of free navigation which it admits is the legal privilege of all cannot be made to cover and shield a felonious attack upon its property, whether at sea or on land, or to prevent it from taking such measures as are necessary to see that this property shall be protected.

Nor is this any question of free or restricted rights of fishery. It may be conceded that the right to take fish in the open sea is a right that belongs equally to all nations, as much as the right of navigation. But the right to take fish, which is conceded, has nothing in common, either in fact or in principle, with the killing of seals. As a matter of fact, the seal is not a fish any more than a duck is a fish; it has none of the characteristics of the fish except the power of swimming, which it possesses in common with many other land animals, both wild and domestic, but which, owing to the fact that its food cannot be found on land, it uses in a greater degree. As a matter of principle, the seal whose home is on the land and whose property relations are clearly ascertainable, cannot be compared with the fish, which has no home; which is not connected with the territory of any state; which, if it were so connected, could not be identified when once in the ocean; and which wanders hither and thither unattached and unattachable until actually captured by the hand of man. The seal of Alaska has, by its natural habits, reduced itself to possession. The fish, by its natural habits, preserves forever the quality of freedom that belongs to the element in which it makes its home.

The right of the United States to the free enjoyment and use of the sea for its seals derives an additional support from prescription. The claim to the exclusive ownership of the fur seal in Alaskan waters was made by Russia, and upon that exclusive claim a company was chartered, and a business was founded which was openly prosecuted for more than half a century, and to which the United States succeeded by purchase. Whether foreign states acquiesced or not in *other claims* made or supposed to have been made by Russia, such as the exclusive right of navigation on the northwest coast, it cannot be pretended that her right to the seal and her right to conduct the exclusive business of breeding, rearing and slaughtering the seal for their fur, which business was transferred to the United States in 1867, was ever denied or even questioned by any nation up to the time of the present controversy. For more than a hundred years the herd of seals inhabiting the Pribyloff Islands has been treated as the sole property of Russia and her successor, the United States, and for nearly ninety years the business has been carried on precisely as it is carried on to-day without a word of protest or dissent.

This additional support of prescription reinforces and strengthens not only the right to carry on the business of taking seal on the islands, but also the right to the use of the sea by the seal for purposes of feeding. This has already been described as in the nature of a usufruct. A usufruct may and often does add materially to the value of real property; in fact, property may exist which is of great value when coupled with a usufruct, but which without it is entirely worthless. It is upon prescription that this species of property more frequently depends, and in the present instance, by confirming the right derived from general principles, it gives a double force to our title to the usufructuary enjoyment of the sea. If the consent of nations were required for the exercise of so clear a right, this consent could rightly be presumed from long acquiescence. The United States therefore finds itself at the present time in a situation that may be described as follows:

The Alaskan seal, in which wherever it can identify them it has an undoubted property right, not only on the islands but when they leave their home with the intention of returning, and when they are enjoying that use of the sea to which all nations alike are entitled, is attacked by marauders, and is in danger of extermination. The United States seeks peaceably and by negotiation to obtain from the government, to whose subjects these marauding vessels belong, such measures of restraint as may prevent these depredations, or, by reducing them, avert their fatal consequences. After several years of fruitless negotiations it finds that, so far from securing a reduction of these depredations, they are greatly on the increase, and to such an extent that its property is threatened with total destruction. Under these circumstances it has a clear and indisputable right to take the protection of its property into its own hands.

Such a course must, however, be confined within the strict limits of the existing property right. These limits, owing to the nature of the seal, are susceptible of easy definition. As we have seen, the owner of wild animals, which stray with the intention of returning, may assert his rights and claim his property, as long as the property can be identified. A waif or stray which bears about it no mark of identification by which the owner can be known is the property of the taker. So it is with the seal.

It is this capacity for identification which fixes the limit

within which the restrictive powers of the United States are operative. When the herd passes out into the broad spaces of the Pacific and disperses hither and thither, no man knows where, mingling, perhaps, with the seal of the Russian islands, perhaps keeping up a separate existence, this country would have no foundation for a complaint against him who kills or captures them. It has no right to protect them, because, under these conditions, it has no means of identifying them, nor would it attempt to assert a right to protect them. But as the spring wears on,—as the mothers feel that their time is drawing near, and seek the land which alone they know as home, and as the remainder of the herd, drawn likewise by an uncontrollable and habitual instinct, concentrate in one vast body preparatory to making their way through the passes of the Aleutian Islands, the identity of the property becomes reëstablished beyond the possibility of a doubt, and the right of the United States to protect them revives in all its original vigor. This identity remains fixed, and this right continues during the period of island residence, and until the annual separation for the winter.

So invariable are the habits of the seal that it is easy to fix both the limit of time and place within which this identification may be made. The assembling of the herd takes place in May of each year in the waters directly to the southward and in the immediate neighborhood of the Aleutian peninsula and islands. The dispersion takes place with equal regularity during the month of November and in the same locality. It is during the period between the annual round-up and the annual separation that the rights of the United States may be asserted and maintained.

Having considered the legal aspect of the question, it only remains to touch upon its moral aspect, to which certain important references have been made in the course of the diplomatic correspondence.

In the letter of January 22, 1890, in which Mr. Blaine first treated in extenso of the grounds upon which the United States were proceeding, reference is made to the fact that the seal poaching, as pursued by Canadian vessels in Behring Sea, is *contra bonos mores*, an act which is in itself immoral. A general statement has already been made of the grounds of this opinion, in describing the habits of the seal, and the effect continued poaching must have upon the future existence of the species.

There are few who will deny the justice of the assertion that any pursuit which must inevitably result in the total destruction of an animal of such valuable qualities to mankind as the fur seal is an evil which should be prevented, if possible—an evil in and of itself, the encouragement of which is, from the nature of things, immoral.

Not only, however, is the general injury and loss to mankind that would result from the destruction of seal life to be considered, but the barbarity and wantonness of the methods by which this destruction is accomplished.

The methods are, in the first place, barbarous, because they consist in the slaughter of the mother seals at a critical moment of their existence, a moment when the sentiment of the whole world, civilized and uncivilized, is alike in agreeing that the mother should be protected,—a sentiment which finds expression not only in the dicta of moralists but in the game laws of every country in the world. In all these expressions of moral law, whether found in ethical writings or in statute books, the pregnant mother and the nursing mother are surrounded with an inviolability—it might almost be said a sanctity—which preserves and protects them. But the mothers whom the poacher destroys are not pregnant mothers alone, or nursing mothers alone, but they are both at the same time, and upon their life hangs the life both of the offspring that is and of that which is to be.

The methods are in the second place wanton, because the number of seals taken bears no proportion to the number killed. Suppose that the poachers get one in six of all that they shoot. Their catch last year amounted to 28,000, representing a direct slaughter of 168,000, to say nothing of the indirect slaughter of the young just born, of the young then in their mother's womb, and of the progeny to which, had they lived, the cows would to a certainty have given birth in the succeeding years. It is a small estimate to place the destruction thus directly and indirectly accomplished in a single season at considerably more than a quarter of a million of animals, nine-tenths of which is of absolutely no benefit to the destroyers. It is well known that other herds of seal equally numerous, which formerly existed in other localities, have by reckless hunting been entirely wiped out of existence, and it is beyond a doubt that the same fate will shortly overtake the last great herd that survives if the present practice is to con-

tinue. Can it be denied that such a pursuit, having such consequences to mankind at large, and carried on with the circumstances of barbarity and wastefulness that have been described above, is *contra bonos mores*, a thing immoral in itself, and to be condemned by the unanimous sentiment of the civilized world?

With regard to this argument Lord Salisbury says: "It is obvious that two questions are involved: First, whether the pursuit and killing of fur seals in certain parts of the open sea is, from the point of view of international morality, an offense *contra bonos mores*; and, secondly, whether if such be the case this fact justifies the seizure on the high seas and subsequent confiscation in time of peace of the private vessels of a friendly nation."

The first of these questions has been already considered. It is thus answered by Lord Salisbury:

"Her Majesty's Government must question whether this pursuit can of itself be regarded as *contra bonos mores*, unless and until, for special reasons, *it has been agreed by international arrangement* to forbid it. Fur-seals are indisputably animals *feræ naturæ*, and these have universally been regarded by jurists as *res nullius* until they are caught; no person, therefore, can have property in them until he has actually reduced them into possession by capture.

"It requires something more than a mere declaration that the Government of citizens of the United States, or even of other countries interested in the seal trade, are losers by a certain course of proceeding, to render that course an immoral one."

It would seem that Lord Salisbury fails to recognize the ancient and well-known distinction between a thing which is *malum in se*, and things which are merely *mala prohibita*. According to his view seal-poaching is not to be considered as immoral at all unless and until the nations of the world have agreed to prohibit it. He forgets that there are some acts which are immoral, independently of any prohibition; whose immorality is derived not from their being prohibited, but from the bad quality inherent in themselves. Some acts are vicious only because they are forbidden by municipal law or by the consent of nations, which forms international law. Other acts are vicious, because they are prohibited by a higher law—a law of nature; and in that case they must be characterized as *mala in se* and as *contra bonos mores* independent of any statute or international agreement. As to the character of an act in itself immoral, neither international nor municipal law can enlarge or diminish the condemnation pronounced by the law of nature. An act that is inherently

wicked requires no legislation or agreement to make it so. Of such a character are the depredations of the seal poachers.

It may be doubted, however, whether Lord Salisbury really meant what he said when he questioned whether a practice could be regarded as *contra bonos mores* until it had been agreed by international arrangement to forbid it. His probable intention was, assuming that seal poaching was immoral, to question what right the United States had to prevent even an immoral practice by the capture of British vessels on the high seas. This it will be observed is an objection quite different from the other, but it is at least reasonable. It is not, however, a difficult question to answer.

The United States does not claim the right to act as the champion of morality among the nations of the earth, and to put down every immoral practice which it may find the subjects of other states committing upon the high seas, but it does claim that where its lawful property interests are made the subject of direct attack by a practice in itself immoral and unjustifiable, it is justified in repelling the assault, and that its right so to act does not depend upon any international agreement. It is not claimed, as Lord Salisbury seems to suppose, that the fact that the United States are losers by "a certain course of proceeding" makes "that course an immoral one," but it is claimed that when a proceeding is already immoral and attacks and infringes the rights of the United States to such an extent as to despoil them of their lawfully acquired property, and property to which as has been shown above, Lord Salisbury's theory of wild animals to the contrary notwithstanding, they have an undoubted title, they are justified in taking such steps as are necessary to protect that property and to prevent that infringement.

The common law gives an application of this principle which presents in the relations of man to man a striking analogy to the present case, arising in the relations of nation to nation. It is a general principle of the common law that a private individual cannot maintain an action for a public or common nuisance. Such a nuisance must be proceeded against by the State; it is indictable, not actionable. But when a common nuisance is of such character that it causes direct damage to my property and constitutes a direct encroachment upon my rights, I may maintain an action in my own name for its abatement. Such is the position of the seal question. The Government of Great Britain by

undertaking to protect and countenance these depredations has permitted, if it has not originally set up, the existence of a common nuisance by which all the world suffers. And the fact that this injury is committed at my doors, against my property, and to my great damage and detriment, justifies me in maintaining that action which, in the case of what was solely a public nuisance, like the slave trade, would require the agreement of all the world.

It may be said that such an action is without precedent, and in support of this position many phrases may be quoted of statesmen and publicists, to the effect that except in case of piracy or international agreement no state can apprehend the vessels of another state upon the high seas, whatever acts they may have committed. That this application of the principle is without precedent in reference to seal poaching has no significance because, as has been freely admitted during the course of the published correspondence, seal poaching on any appreciable scale did not exist prior to the present controversy. That the protection of property at sea is not specifically stated by jurists as an exception to the general right of free navigation for merchant vessels is not surprising, seeing that it depends upon the great and fundamental law of self-preservation, which, as every jurist knows, may be an exception to any rule, and must be considered as an implied exception in the statement of every principle. Suppose that a British subject, or a colony of British subjects, should put the victims of epidemic disease upon a vessel and moor that vessel off the harbor of New York in the track of commerce proceeding to or from that port, but well outside of the so-called limit of territorial jurisdiction. Does anybody suppose that the United States would allow such a pest-ship to remain long in its position? Would it be prevented by any theory of the freedom of ocean navigation, or territoriality of the British vessel, or the inviolability of the British flag, from abating summarily this common nuisance which brought upon it specific injury? Would it wait to hunt up a precedent? A novel injury justifies a novel precedent. Or, finally, because of the general principle of non-interference with ships on the high seas, except in cases of piracy, would the law compel it to defer action until that action could be tied up in the red tape of an international compact?

As a matter of fact, however, the principle that the law of

self-preservation is an implied exception to the general rules governing international relations has been repeatedly laid down with distinctness by the highest authorities, especially in its application to maritime jurisdiction. It was stated by no less accomplished a jurist than Chief Justice Marshall, in a decision in the Supreme Court of the United States (Church vs. Hubbart, 2 Cranch, 234), in speaking of seizures made by a State, outside of the marine limit:

"Its power to secure itself from injury may certainly be exercised beyond the limits of its territory. Any attempt to violate the laws made to protect this right (Colonial commerce) is an injury to itself which it may prevent, and it has a right to use the means necessary for its prevention. These means do not appear to be limited within any certain marked boundaries, which remain the same at all times and in all situations. If they are such as are unnecessarily to vex and harass foreign lawful commerce, foreign nations will resist their exercise. If they are such as are reasonable and necessary to secure their laws from violation, they will be submitted to."

A similar doctrine was applied by the Supreme Court in a later case (Hudson vs. Guestier, 6 Cranch, 281), where a capture was made six leagues from the land.

An equally clear and emphatic statement of the doctrine was made in a debate in the House of Lords, in 1878, by the Lord Chancellor, upon a question arising out of the celebrated case of the Franconia. Speaking of the limits of territorial jurisdiction at sea, the Lord Chancellor said:

"It appears to be established as a matter of principle that there must be a zone. The only doubt was, as to how far our limits extend. The authorities were clear on this, that if three miles were not found sufficient for purpose of defence and protection, or if the nature of the trade or commerce in the zone required, there was a power in the country on the seaboard to extend the zone."

No higher or clearer authorities could be given to show that the ultimate test of the extent of maritime jurisdiction at sea is to be found in the necessities of self-preservation, and covering the protection and security of the state and its property, and the persons and property of its subjects.

Such is the question which the United States, strong in the justice of its cause, and controlled by that spirit of forbearance and adherence to order and law which should always govern in both domestic and international controversies, has now submitted to an impartial arbitration. It had no other alternative but to appeal to the God of battles.

B. F. TRACY.

THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY PROFESSOR DEWAR'S DISCOVERIES.

BY R. OGDEN DOREMUS, M. D., LL. D., PROF. OF CHEMISTRY AND PHYSICS, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, AND PROF. OF CHEMISTRY, TOXICOLOGY, AND MEDICAL JURISPRUDENCE, BELLEVUE HOSPITAL MEDICAL COLLEGE.

In 1654 the reigning Emperor of Germany, Ferdinand III., with his court, honored the inventor of the air pump, Otto von Guericke, by witnessing his experiments. Among other tests von Guericke applied the carefully ground edges of metallic hemispheres, two feet in diameter, to each other. After exhausting them of air, he attached fifteen horses to each hemisphere. In vain did they attempt to separate them, because of the enormous pressure of the atmosphere. Torricelli, of Italy, and Pascal, of France, had already devised mercurial, water, and wine barometers, for measuring the same with accuracy, in 1643, but these important discoveries did not attract wide-spread public attention.

Napoleon I., in the beginning of this century, invited Volta from Pisa to Paris to exhibit the marvels of his electric battery to the *savants* of the French capital, and was present at each *séance*. The deepest interest was excited over the civilized world in the newly-revealed modification of electricity.

The Prince of Wales, towards the close of this century, presides at a lecture by Prof. James Dewar, at the Royal Institution,* on "Liquid Air." The ear of the public is now awakened to the liquefaction and solidification of gases.

Aristotle taught the ancient doctrine of the four elements, "earth, air, fire and water," and suggested a fifth, filling space, which he called "ether." Van Helmont, in the sixteenth century, applied the term "gas" to aeriform substances. He said :

* Founded in 1799 by an American gentleman, Mr. Benjamin Thompson, born near Rumford, Mass.; afterwards known as Count Rumford.

"*Gas est spiritus non-coagulabilis.*" It was a favorite belief in ancient times that gases, ghosts or hobgoblins were invisible existences inhabiting the bowels of the earth. They were protectors of its treasures, antagonistic to humanity, throttling or destroying with violent explosion intruders in mines.

Chemists are now firm believers in spirits. They can make them appear at their bidding, and of every color in the rainbow, varying also in weight, flavor, and chemical potency, good angels and bad ones. They can stimulate them to war with each other, so that the malign influences of one class are destroyed in the conflict. Chemists can materialize the spirits and force them to assume liquid or solid forms.

In former times, by their efficient aid, the chemist could produce the most intense heat. Hence he was called the "Philosopher by Fire." He can now by changing their visible to an invisible condition obtain severest cold. He may therefore add to his title that of the "Philosopher by Frost."

Modern chemistry is built on a spiritual basis. One of these gases (oxygen) exceeds in weight all the other elements on this globe. United mostly with metals, it forms its solid crust and its continents; with another spirit (hydrogen) it forms the waters of its oceans, seas, lakes and rivers. In a gaseous form it is mingled, democratically, with numerous others to form the air. Our atmosphere is the grand reservoir of hosts of spirits. It is the blue ethereal envelope of mother earth: the cerulean mantle worthy of God, the Spirit! It is the aerial laboratory in which the great problems of existence are solved—"the cradle of vegetable and coffin of animal life."*

How closely we are related to the world of spirits we rarely reflect. We are embodied in them and they are embedded in our bodies. They haunt us when awake, during our daily avocations. They are necessary adjuvants to the arm of labor and the brain of thought. Without their aid we can do nothing. These guardian spirits watch over us while we sleep, and like Vestal virgins, they keep alive the vital flame when our wearied muscles and tired senses repose from their activity, By telescopic aid we behold gaseous investitures enwrapping our associate planets. We know the direction of the winds in some of these remote orbs, by the drifting of their clouds. The spectroscope demonstrates to us

* Prof. John W. Draper. *Chemistry of Plants.*

that the vastly more distant nebulæ are embryonic gaseous universes, similar in condition to that in which our own system existed, according to the theory of Herschel and Laplace.

How successfully spirits have eluded human investigators is shown by the years, yea centuries, of observation and research involved in their discovery. Paracelsus in 1500 A. D. noticed the evolution of *air* when sulphuric acid was poured on iron. Seventy-two years passed before its inflammability was discovered by Turquet de Mayerne and also by Boyle. In 1700 Lemery detected its detonating properties when mingled with the atmosphere. In 1766 Macquer and De la Metherie observed that moisture was produced when the gas was burnt. Cavendish in the same year first accurately reported the characteristics of "inflammable air," as he called the gas which was entitled *hydrogen* by Lavoisier in 1774. Over two and a half centuries were required for the discovery of this lightest of all spirits, *hydrogen*.

For the isolation of the gas most essential for the evolution of heat, light, electricity and for the sustenance of animal and human life, namely, *oxygen*, more than two thousand years of patient research were necessary! In the middle of the sixth century B. C., Heraclitus said: "Air contains a subtile element which sustains fire and respiration." In 480 B. C., Anaximenes of Miletus wrote: "Air is the origin of all things; and all things return to it after certain evolutions." Eck, of Sulzbach, in the fifteenth century, first demonstrated experimentally that the weight of metals is increased when calcined. In 1630 Brun repeated this discovery after prolonged heating of lead and of tin. In the act of calcination, or, as we now term it, oxidation, they became heavier. Mayow, of England, in 1669, and Priestley, in 1774, released this "vital air," as it was called, by heating red precipitate, oxide of mercury, with the sun's rays through the aid of a lens.

By exposing a growing plant, inclosed in a glass vessel in which a mouse had died for want of pure air, to the same solar rays, Priestley demonstrated the power of the tissue of the green leaf, under this stimulus, to decompose the expired carbonic acid gas from the lungs of the little creature and evolve "vital air." As Dr. Franklin quaintly expressed it, "the plant mended the air." Lavoisier, of France, and Scheele, of Sweden, also discovered this element of elements. To the French philosopher we are indebted for its present name, the acid maker, *oxygen*.

Scheele discovered the following gases—chlorine, hydrocyanic acid, hydrofluoric acid, arseniuretted hydrogen and tetrafluoride of silicon. Nitrogen gas, which forms four-fifths of our atmosphere, was discovered by Rutherford in 1772. "Fixed air," or carbonic acid, was released from carbonates, as now designated by Black in 1755.

In 1823 Prof. Michael Faraday commenced his experiments on the liquefaction of gases, by pressure *alone*, unaided by great cold. He converted the following gases into the liquid state :

	Pressure of Atmospheres.	Temperature.
Cyanogen	3.7	3.7° C.
Sulphurous Acid	3	7.2°
Chlorine	4	15.5°
Ammonia	6.5	10°
Sulphuretted hydrogen	17	10°
Carbonic acid	36	10°
Nitrous oxide	50	7.2°
Hydrochloric acid	50	10°

Many solids when dissolved in liquids absorb heat. Wine is cooled in India by placing the bottles in water containing crystals of nitrate of potash. The "*eau sucrée*" of the Frenchman is cool because the lumps of sugar are changed in form. The "sherry-cobbler" and "mint julep" of the Yankee are several degrees below the freezing point of water, because two solids, ice and sugar, are rapidly dissolved in sherry or other wine. If liquids rapidly assume the gaseous form a great reduction of temperature results. Thin sheets of ice have been made, even in hot climates, by exposing water in shallow pans to a clear sky at night, to secure speedy evaporation of a part of the water.

Dr. Black, of Edinburgh, first clearly enunciated the laws of "latent heat." At the exact point when a solid begins to liquefy by heat, its rise in temperature is arrested until it is all melted. A similar phenomenon occurs when the visible liquid changes to an invisible gas. The heat required for this transformation is vastly greater. Hence the appropriateness of the term "heat of form." When we would reverse these changes, as from the impalpable to the visible liquid, or solid, we must abstract this heat. In 1834 Thillorier solidified large quantities of carbonic gas by rapidly evaporating the liquefied gas. When the snowy-looking solid is mingled with its solvent ether, a most intense cold results as they both assume the gaseous state. By evaporating them in vacuo, Faraday attained the lowest temperature then known.

Many gases cannot be liquefied by simple pressure. At the "*critical point*," differing with each gas, the expansive power of heat must be abstracted. Intense cold must coöperate with force. By these combined agencies, in 1877, Cailletet, of Paris, announced to the French "Academy of Sciences" that he had liquefied oxygen, also carbon monoxide, by employing a pressure of 300 atmospheres and by the evaporation of liquid sulphurous acid, reducing the temperature to —29 degrees C. On the same day the following telegram from Raoul Pictet, of Geneva, was read before this society: "Oxygène liquéfié aujourd'hui sous 320 atmosphères, et 140° de froid, par acid sulfureux et carbonique accouplés."

In 1878 Pictet liquefied hydrogen gas, employing a pressure of 650 atmospheres (about five tons) per square inch (!) and a temperature of —140 degrees C. The following table presents at a glance these interesting discoveries:

GASES LIQUEFIED.

	Atmos.	Temp. Cent.
Cyanogen	4	+ 15°
Chlorine	8.5	+ 12°
Ammonia	6.25	+ 10°
Nitrous oxide	40	+ 7.2°
Ethylene	46	+ 4°
Carbon dioxide	54	+ 18.3°
Acetylene	86	+ 15°
Nitric oxide	104	— 11°
Marsh gas	108	— 11°
Nitrogen	300	— 13°
Carbon monoxide	300	— 29°
Oxygen	300	— 140°
Hydrogen	650	— 140°

LIQUEFIED GASES BOIL AT

	C.
Carbon dioxide	— 80°
Nitrous oxide	— 90°
Ethylene	— 103°
Nitric oxide	— 153°
Marsh gas	— 161°
Oxygen	— 184°
Air	— 192.2°, mean — 191°
Carbon monoxide	— 193°
Nitrogen	— 198.1°

The lowest temperatures yet attained are here tabulated:

Faraday with solid carbon dioxide and ether in vac. obtained	— 110° C.
Natterer with solid nitrous ox. and carbon disulphide obtained	— 140° C.
Olzewski by evaporation of liquid air obtained	— 210° C.
Olzewski with solid nitrogen in vac. obtained	— 225° C.

Professor Dewar employed liquefied ethylene (olefiant gas) in producing the intense cold necessary to liquefy the air. One thousand pounds sterling was the liberal contribution of the "Goldsmiths' Company" for the expense of the ingenious means for compressing and cooling the gases. Both M. Cailletet and M.

Pictet spent much money, as well as intellectual work in accomplishing their results.

I have frequently been asked: "Of what use are these interesting, laborious and costly experiments?" To the scientist they have demonstrated that solids, liquids and gases differ in form because of differences in "heat of form." They support the nebular hypothesis as to the primitive condition of our universe. They carry him back to an epoch anterior to *visible* nebulæ, when radiant energies such as heat, light and electricity had not announced themselves—when all was "*without form and void; and darkness was on the face of the deep*" (profound). When the gaseous elements commenced their combination these forces resulted. And God said: "Let there be light, and there was light," generously diffused through immensity. By movements excited, the fluids broke into clusters, suns, planets and satellites. Some cooled to liquids, in the course of immeasureable ages, and became encrusted spheres. On one of these life appeared.

By heat we greatly stimulate chemical affinities. At the low temperatures attained by these ingenious experiments, chemical activities are diminished. Oxygen refuses to burn with carbon, phosphorus and potassium. Chlorine will not unite with elements with which, at common temperatures, it combines with great avidity. Electric conductivity, magnetic relations, spectroscopic effects have been successfully studied with these newly-formed liquids. Paalzow, of Berlin, determined the modulus of elasticity of mercury by the use of this metal frozen in the shape of a tuning-fork. At the frigorific laboratory of Pictet, in Berlin, solid chloroform, alcohol and other chemicals are prepared in purer condition than ever before. Thus, a new era in chemical manufacture has been inaugurated.

Many of these liquefied gases are daily employed for *mechanical* purposes. Fifteen years ago the United States Government propelled torpedo boats with liquid carbonic acid. Two companies are now organized in this city for propelling street cars, one of them by the aforesaid liquid, the other by liquefied ammonia.* When we navigate the air, it will be by the aid of this concentrated power.

*Several years before the death of Commodore Vanderbilt the writer was invited to his residence to discuss the employment of liquid ammonia for street cars. The Commodore said: "It makes me sick to see the poor horses dragging a load of from thirty to fifty passengers on a hot day."

The sunken iron-clad, "Grösser Kurfurst," was floated to the surface of the water by attaching to the vessel gas-tight bags and inflating them from receptacles of liquid carbonic acid. Steel rings on Krupp's most formidable cannon have been placed in position by previously cooling, and thus shrinking, the gun with this liquid. The metallic armatures of the colossal microscope now being constructed in Munich for the World's Fair at Chicago are guarded against the heat of the electric light by the escape of a little jet from a cylinder of liquid carbonic acid. Tons of this liquid are made daily in Berlin and other European cities and exported to this country. In New York the American Carbonate Company have produced it on a large scale for many years. Tens of thousands of wrought iron cylinders, with from ten to twenty pounds of the liquid are sold annually in different parts of the world.

For half a century, water has been frozen in caraffes and in plates of ice, by the evaporation of ether; later with liquefied ammonia, sulphurous and carbonic acids; also by the sudden expansion of compressed air. Artificial ice from distilled water is a commercial product. Ice is even made for skating rinks. All kinds of meat, game, fish and fruit are preserved by similar means, and could be kept for as unlimited a time as the ancient elephants found by the Russian scientist, Pallas, in Siberia, in 1799, which had been frozen in Nature's ice box. The dogs of the Jackoutes partook of the flesh with evident delight. Besides capacious refrigerating rooms, compartments in cars and ships are artificially cooled for the transportation of articles of diet. One large steamer was exclusively arranged as a floating refrigerator for conveying meat from Texas. Liquefied carbonic acid was employed as the cooling agent.

I have found, after several months' experimenting, that the domestic refrigerator could be kept at 40 degrees F. by the evaporation of liquid ammonia at a less cost than by employing ice. A lower temperature than this is undesirable. In hundreds of breweries, ammonia machines are used for cooling purposes in preference to ice, both for economy and cleanliness; also for forcing beer from cellars and aerating it.

Since witnessing, in 1847, the experiments of Professor Gmelin, in Heidelberg, with liquid carbonic acid, I have enjoyed years of practical experience in liquefying thousands of gallons of this

gas and producing bushels of the snowy solid with Thillorier's apparatus. I have shown it to students in colleges, and at public lectures, where not only a hundred pounds of mercury have often been frozen in a few minutes, but also where electrical phenomena were exhibited, caused by the friction during the rapid escape of the liquid and its sudden change of form. Sparks were drawn from an insulated "prime conductor," and the repulsion of similarly electrified light objects were witnessed by an audience filling the Academy of Music.

About thirty years ago the United States Government appointed a commission to examine and report on methods for saving life on shipboard. I repeatedly exhibited to this commission the efficacy of liquid carbonic acid in extinguishing fires, and suggested that wrought-iron cylinders, filled with this liquid, should be placed on the decks of vessels and connected with iron tubes passing by the side of the stanchions into various compartments. Should spontaneous combustion of cotton, jute, coal, etc., occur, the fire would be instantly extinguished by releasing the gas and driving it by its enormous pressure into the hold of the ship. The commission reported unanimously in favor of this method, and advised the passage of a law by the United States Government requiring all our vessels to be provided with such means for extinguishing fires and saving life.

Similar experiments were also shown to a committee appointed by the "New York Board of Marine Underwriters." The committee commended this mode of putting out fires in the highest terms. It is especially applicable in our bonded warehouses which contain merchandise valued at millions of dollars. By the use of carbonic acid gas, forced in large quantities from the liquid in reservoirs, the fire would not only be instantly extinguished, but no injury would occur to the most delicate fabrics of silk, satin or velvet, as if water or steam were employed.

In 1862 I assisted M. Barthelemy Bianchi in exhibiting before the Academy of Sciences, in Paris, the liquefaction of nitrous oxide gas by a novel form of pump. Interesting experiments were shown with both the liquid and solid "laughing gas." Since that time I have annually exhibited it to students and to the public.

For many years I have urged that these liquefied gases should be utilized to temper the heat of summer in our homes and hospitals, our banks and business offices, our sumptuous edi-

fices for pleasure or piety. I have ventured to say: "If they can cool dead hogs in Chicago, why not live 'bulls and bears' in the New York Stock Exchange?" Citizens would be happier, merchants would make more money, and physicians would save more lives with the temperature at 70 degrees Fahr. than at 90 or 100 degrees.

The surgeon produces local anæsthesia by a spray of ether or a jet of cold gas from liquid nitrous oxide. Dr. Colton administered a dose of laughing gas to Dr. Wells, of Hartford, by his request, in 1844, and a tooth was extracted without pain. Now the liquefied gas is sent to all parts of the world for dental purposes. This anæsthetic, which has been inhaled by some patients for over an hour, is esteemed by many eminent surgeons and obstetricians as the safest of all. Fewer fatal results have occurred by its use than from the employment of ether or chloroform. Methyl chloride has been introduced so recently that a comparison cannot be made. The anæsthetics are the greatest blessings chemistry has offered at the shrine of medicine.

Liquefied chlorine and sulphurous acid are sold for bleaching purposes. They are also most efficient disinfectants. In the summer of 1865, I was authorized by Mayor Gunther to disinfect vessels entering New York harbor from certain foreign ports, where cholera existed. During the voyage of one of these steamships, the "Atalanta," sixty passengers had died from this disease. Chlorine was generated in enormous volumes in this ship, and in all the vessels from infected places. No case of this dreaded malady appeared in our city, proving the efficiency of chlorine. In the surgical wards of Bellevue Hospital, the walls of which had become magazines of disease, over two tons of chlorine gas were successfully employed by the writer to destroy the malign agents; following them effectively through plaster and stone walls. It has since then been applied in many hospitals.

Liquid chlorine, or sulphurous acid (the gas produced by burning sulphur) can now be handled in compact form, and liberated in rooms, where typhus, small-pox, scarlet fever, diphtheria, or other fearful maladies have injured or slain their victims. The records in our daily journals, within a few weeks, tell us that the luxurious mansions and hotels of our city can boast of no exemption from contagion.

R. Ogden Doremus.

A RAILWAY PARTY IN POLITICS.

BY HARRY P. ROBINSON, PRESIDENT OF THE "RAILWAY AGE AND NORTHWESTERN RAILROADER."

IN THE course of a letter to the writer of this article the president of one of the strongest railway companies in the West, said recently:

> With few exceptions the people of the United States believe that they have the right, and it has been clearly demonstrated that they have the power, to compel railroads to serve them at such rates as they (the people) consider reasonable. The people apparently believe that in fixing minimum rates they can and do fairly consider the just claims of shareholders as well as their own. That the slave should complain by reason of being deprived of such rights as freemen enjoy the master may reasonably expect; but so long as by law he continues to be master such complaints will have little or no influence with him. If the dictatorial power of the people over railway management is not to be exercised in the future as it has been in the past, so as to work complete confiscation of shareholders' interest in all the weaker lines, the change will, in my opinion, be by reason of the organization of a political party representing railway shareholders and railway employees. Such a party should have no secrets. It should never nominate candidates for political office, but it should demand such protection for railway property as the law gives to other property, and should as often as may be necessary hold and exercise the balance of power at the polls as between the two dominant political parties.

Part of this letter was afterwards published with its author's consent, and as a result other letters were received by the writer from nearly a score of railway presidents and railway managers, all bearing upon the question of the advisability of organizing a new "railway party" in politics, to protect the interests of the investors in, and employees of, the railways. Lengthy quotations from these letters would only be tedious. It is sufficient to say that, while the writers differed widely as to the wisdom, viewed merely as a question of politics, of forming a new party, there

was no shadow of divergence of opinion as to the fact that the right to "regulate" the railways, which is vested in the State, has now been carried in the West to a point not only beyond the bounds of justice, but beyond its constitutional limits, and that it would soon be impossible for any railway company in the West to keep out of bankruptcy unless some vigorous and concerted action were taken to arouse public opinion, and to compel a modification of the present policy.

It is easy to see how much strength such a party, if formed, would possess. According to the reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission, there were in the immediate employ of the railways of the United States a year and a half ago 749,301 men—all or nearly all voters—which number has now, it may be assumed, been increased to about 800,000. There are, in addition, about one million and a quarter shareholders in the railway properties of the country; and in other trades and industries immediately dependent upon the railways for their support, there are estimated to be engaged, as principals or employees, over one million voters more. These three classes united would give at once a massed voting strength of some three millions of voters. There are also, in the smaller towns especially, and at points where railway shops are located, all over the country, a number of persons, small tradesmen, boarding-house keepers, etc., who are dependent for their livelihood on the patronage of railway employees, and whose vote could unquestionably be cast in harmony with any concerted employees' movement. Moreover, unlike most new parties, this party would be at no loss for the sinews of war or for the means of organization. The men whom it would include form even now almost a disciplined army. With them coöperation is already a habit. While the financial backing and the commercial and political strength of which the party would find itself possessed from its birth would be practically unlimited.

It is not surprising then that enthusiasts should declare that it would not be necessary to do more than go through the mere form of organization—to call a meeting or two and issue a few pronunciamentos—for the leaders of the new party to be able to dictate a presidential nominee and the outlines of a policy to either of the two great parties.

There exists, however, no immediate probability of this party being formed. Experience has impressed upon railway men the

unwisdom of "the corporations" appearing in politics, and so long as there remains a chance of obtaining their ends (what they claim to be no more than their rights under the Constitution of the United States) by gentler means, the greater number are reluctant to contemplate the necessity of using the last weapon. For the present it seems to them better to believe that the people —those people who are not railway men—are acting now only in ignorance and that, as soon as they see the truth, they will by their own instinctive sense of justice re-mould their opinions and their policy without political coercion.

At the same time there has already come into existence in some of the Western States a movement which has its significance and its practical influence. This is what is called The Railway Employees' Club movement. It started in Minnesota, at a small meeting of railway employees held in Minneapolis in 1888. From that meeting the movement grew and made a certain feeble effort, not entirely unsuccessful, to influence the State election in the fall of that year. By the State election of 1890 the movement had grown and was better organized, and the Employees' Club did exercise considerable influence in the election of certain of the State officers and certain members of the State legislature in that year.

From Minnesota the movement spread to Iowa, and there is no contradiction of the fact that the railway employees' vote was one of the strongest forces in the State election of the fall of 1891. It also overflowed into Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, and Texas. Had the election of last November been normal, it is probable that the effect of the Railway Employees' Club vote would have been as visible in two or three of those States then as it had been in Iowa in the preceding year. But in the deluge which occurred all trace of the smaller streams and currents was obliterated. Had the members of the clubs not taken the precaution to do considerable work in the local nominating conventions of both parties, they would be compelled to confess that their campaign of 1892 was a failure.

In Iowa, and at first in Minnesota, attempts were made to represent the movement as a movement of "the corporations." There are no facts to justify this cry. The movement originated with the employees—men from the shops and the yards—and has been managed by them. The membership of the clubs consists

wholly of employees. In each of the States mentioned above there are from 15,000 to 30,000 railway employees. With the indirect influence that these men can command (among the tradesmen, boarding-house keepers, etc., as above suggested), a vote materially larger than this could, presumably, be controlled. But omitting this consideration and allowing for defections and the omissions of imperfect organization, it is obvious that the railway employees' vote is strong enough in any State to hold the balance of power in an ordinary election.

So far the clubs have admitted and will admit of no negotiations with the State committees of other parties. They hold their own meetings and decide for themselves that such and such a candidate is inimical to their interests as railway employees, and such and such a man is their friend. Then they go to the polls and vote—voting in the main their normal party ticket, scratching only a man here and a man there, their attention being chiefly centred upon members of the boards of railroad commissioners and of the State legislatures.

In Minnesota in 1890 their weight was thrown chiefly in favor of Republicans. In Iowa in 1891 it was given to Democrats. In all States the men whom they oppose are those who have made themselves conspicuous as "granger" and anti-railway politicians. The keynote of the movement and the one plank in the platform of the clubs is that the extreme anti-railroad legislation of late years has reduced the earnings of the companies to a point at which they are unable any longer to keep full forces on their pay-rolls or to pay such wages as they should, and that by this legislation the railway employees are necessarily the immediate sufferers.

A railway party is therefore already in existence, but it is scattered, decentralized and incoherent. It has no recognition from the railway interests themselves—meaning by that "the corporations"—or their officials. On the contrary, a number of the heads of the railway companies regard the movement with profound distrust. None the less it has strength, and the potentiality of much greater strength. And, moreover, though accidentally only, it is working forcibly in behalf of railway interests as a whole.

But the early proportions of a new movement are no index to its permanence or the righteousness of its principles.

Nothing is easier than to exaggerate the strength and the merits of a young cause. Far more important than any speculations as to the possible strength of a hypothetical party, or an enumeration of the forces and failings of the existing employees' movement in individual States, is the question whether or not there is justice underlying the movement, and whether or not any such great wrong is being done as can need so drastic a remedy as the calling into existence of a new party to right it.

Are the railway presidents and managers right in their apparently unanimous opinion that the regulation of railways by the State (or by the States) has grown to be a persecution or confiscation of their property? Are the railway employees justified in believing that granger legislation is robbing them of their means of living?

The size of the railway interests, with their tremendous investment of capital, is comprehended by few people and, indeed, can hardly be grasped. Perhaps the most striking statement of the magnitude of the railway capital is that made by Professor Hadley: "The capital engaged in banking is but a trifle beside it. The world's whole stock of money of every kind—gold, silver and paper—would purchase only a third of its railroads." The capitalization and bonded debt of the railways of the United States at the beginning of the year 1893 was somewhere about $11,500,000,000. The gross earnings of all the railways in the country during 1891 were about $2,000,000,000, or about six times as large as the entire annual revenue of the United States government. It is difficult to understand how interests so vast can be suffering under persecution, or how it is possible that they can be struggling for their existence.

The writer had occasion some little time since to analyze the reports showing the condition of the railway companies in a number of the Western States, with especial reference to the dividend-paying capacities of the properties. The result was the discovery that in the seven States of Iowa, Minnesota, two Dakotas, Wisconsin, Nebraska and Kansas, there were in all ninety separate companies operating lines. Of these only fifteen earned dividends and seventy-five failed to do so.

In his first report (for the year ending June 30, 1888) the statistician to the Interstate Commerce Commission showed that of all the stocks of the railways of the country $2,500,000,000

were unproductive of dividends. In his second report (for the year ending June 30, 1889) he showed that $2,621,497,932 were unproductive. In his third report (for the year ending June 30, 1890) he shows that $2,811,526,552 were unproductive.

During these years, of course, the capitalization was also increasing; but not only was the amount of unproductive stock in 1890 absolutely larger than the amount in 1889 or in 1888, but the proportion of unproductive stock to the total amount of stock was also greater. That is to say, that while the unproductive stock in 1888 was 61.67 per cent. of the total, in 1890 it was 63.76 per cent. Only 36 per cent., therefore, of the stock of the railways of the country was earning a dividend, while the rest—or very nearly $3,000,000,000—was absolutely unproductive of revenue to its holders.

This large proportion of unremunerative investment is not equally distributed through the different sections of the country. For purposes of classification and comparison, the Interstate Commerce Commission has divided the railways of the United States into arbitrary territorial groups. In the States of Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas and Colorado, 72.90 per cent. of all stocks is unproductive. In Oregon, Washington, Idaho, California, Utah, and Nevada 83.54 per cent. is unproductive. In Texas 99.99 per cent. is unproductive. The railway systems of these last two groups, viewed as a whole, showed a deficit of earnings below operating expenses and fixed charges of over eight millions of dollars.

In the territory west of the line formed by the Mississippi and Missouri rivers there were 51,256 miles of line which made returns to the Interstate Commerce Commission, being almost exactly one-third of the entire mileage on which the Commission bases its calculations, viz., 156,404 miles. Supposing these 51,256 miles of line to have been one property their entire net earnings, after paying operating expenses and fixed charges, would have been for the year 1889 $594,419. The amount of the capital stock of these lines was $1,326,535,625 and the above net earnings on this amount to .04 per cent.—one twenty-fifth of one per cent.

With four times as many miles of road, the net earnings on these Western lines were less than one-third of the net earnings of the group of lines in the two Virginias and two Carolinas. With considerably more than double the mileage of the lines in the group including the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Missis-

sippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida, their net earnings were barely one-eighth as large. With more than seven times the mileage of the lines in the New England States their earnings were less than one-twentieth as large. With considerably more than double the mileage of the lines in New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware, and Pennsylvania their net earnings were only one-seventieth as large. These calculations might be continued almost indefinitely.

The common argument with which all statements of the unprofitableness of railway capital are met is that railway capital is largely watered, that it represents small investment and that it does not deserve to be profitable. But is it possible that all the capital stock of these lines—one-third of the railway mileage of the country—is "water"? Do the $1,326,535,625 represent no investment whatever? I doubt if there is any well-informed authority on railway affairs in the country who believes that the railways of the United States could be duplicated to-day for the $11,500,000,000 of their capital and bonded debt.

Colossal individual fortunes have been made out of railways, and while these fortunes exist it is easy for the demagogue to point to them and convince an uninformed audience that the talk of the poverty of the railways is nonsense. But it is as frivolous to cite a fortune made in the manipulation of stocks as an evidence of the profitableness of the operation of railways as it would be to advance a fortune made in the wheat ring as a proof that farming pays. Wall Street fortunes are not built up of dividends; and the impoverished or bankrupt property offers certainly not the least inviting field for the unscrupulous or "bold" speculator.

I have outlined above some of the conditions surrounding the railways of the West to-day—the conditions which cause railway presidents and managers to talk of the necessity of forming a new party, and which the railway employees consider sufficient to justify them in organizing to prevent further anti-railway legislation. I have done it in the hope that it may contribute something towards the enlightenment of what the president of Harvard College calls the "uninformed public opinion of the West." The facts about railway finances are but little understood as yet, and Prof. H. C. Adams, in his first statistical report to the Interstate Commerce Commission, expressed the opinion that

"it is more than likely that if the facts pertaining to railroads were properly collected, massed and interpreted, the demand for a very considerable increase of legislation, which would otherwise be necessary, will disappear."

Since the delivery of the opinions in the granger cases, the United States courts have taken many opportunities to restrain the States from excessive "regulation" of railway properties. The right of the State to control the railways is no longer a matter of argument, but since that right was established the courts have further held at different times that this right of regulation is itself not without limitation; that the power to regulate is not the power to destroy; that railway companies have a right to live; that they cannot be compelled to carry persons or freight without reward, and that railway capital is entitled to some "compensation" over and above the payment of wages, operating expenses and fixed charges. In what are known as the Minnesota Rate cases the Supreme Court of the United States withheld the Railroad Commission of that State from the enforcement of an order which would have involved the most flagrant and obvious confiscation of railway property; and orders which seem to railway men at least to be no less unjust and unconstitutional are to-day being enforced, or sought to be enforced, by the commissions of Texas, of Kansas, of Iowa—and perhaps of other States. From one, if not from all, of these States cases similar to the Minnesota cases are likely to be carried to the United States Supreme Court and passed upon there. So, point by point, the tribunal which gave to the State forever its power to control its railways is shutting the doors against the abuse of that power. But the process is a slow one. Meanwhile Mr. A. F. Walker, the chairman of the joint committee of the Trunk Line and Central Traffic associations, prophesies that if things go on as they are going now, before long "the managers of the railways will be chiefly receivers." In the year 1891 receivers were appointed for twenty-six companies in the United States, representing $84,479,000 of capital, and twenty-one companies with 3,223 miles of road with a capitalization of $186,000,000 were sold under foreclosure.

It is doubtful whether the result which Mr. Walker foretells would be regarded as a calamity by the "uninformed public opinion of the West." That Minnesota railroad commissioner

was quite sure of the public applause before he made his classic declaration that he proposed to "shake the railroads over Hell" before he had done with them, and the Governor of Iowa, who announced that he did not care if "every d—d railroad in the State went into bankruptcy" before the expiration of his term of office, knew that the sentiment would have the sympathies of his constituents. This attitude of the Western mind is, of course largely explained by the fact that the people of the West do not as a rule own railway securities. In two States (the only two in the West in which, so far as I am aware, the figures have been compiled) out of 27,645 stockholders in the lines within the State borders only 359 are residents of the States. If the other 27,286 were also residents of these States (that is to say, if 27,286 of the present residents were also stockholders in the railways) it is probable that the ferocity of the public opinion in these States against railways would be materially modified.

HARRY P. ROBINSON.

THE ANN ARBOR STRIKE.

BY FRANK P. SARGENT, GRAND MASTER OF THE BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN.

A STRIKE is a declaration of war. It is therefore the policy of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen to discourage strikes, and adopt other methods for the settlement of disagreements with employers, strictly in accordance with common sense, always having in view the welfare of the parties to the controversy. To verify this statement, it is only necessary to refer to the constitution and laws of the Brotherhood, which are eminently conservative and democratic.

The laws of the Brotherhood recognize the sovereignty of the membership. They confer no arbitrary power upon the Chief Executive of the Order. He cannot "order" a strike. He cannot "call out" the men. He cannot arrest the business of railroads. In this connection, it may be prudent to briefly outline what is required to engage in a strike. First, a grievance committee states definitely to the proper officials of a railroad the particular wrongs which it is desirable to have corrected. If the official to whom application is made gives audience to the committee, matters are fully discussed and in a vast majority of cases a satisfactory arrangement results. If, however, an agreement is not arrived at, the Chief Executive of the Order is notified, and, when made entirely familiar with the situation, he takes up the case and presents it, if permitted, to the highest official of the corporation. If a conference is granted, the grievances are discussed and earnest efforts made, on the part of the Brotherhood, to reach satisfactory conclusions and if possible to avoid a strike. Concessions are usually made and compromises agreed upon, but if, finally, no agreement results, a strike does not, necessarily, occur at once. On the contrary, the laws of the

Order require that the road or system be canvassed, for a strike cannot be declared unless two-thirds of the men interested vote in favor thereof, and then only when sanctioned by the Grand Master in conjunction with the committee having the matter in charge. It will be observed that the Brotherhood has adopted, to the extent of its power, wise precautions against everything hasty or ill-advised, calculated to precipitate a strike.

In the case of the strike on the Toledo, Ann Arbor and North Michigan Railroad, which occurred on March 8th, every precaution here outlined was taken, and every movement on the part of the members of the Order was deliberate and lawful. There was not an instance of insubordination; nothing turbulent or seditious. Men had appealed to their employers like men, to have serious and grievous wrongs redressed in a manly way, as became good and law-abiding citizens. They had been overworked and underpaid. Their employers had violated contracts and had subjected them to outrageous treatment, and mocked at their complaints. Their pleadings and protests had availed not, and when endurance and patience had ceased to be virtues, when all efforts to find redress had utterly failed, then, and only then, did they strike; only then did they assert their manhood, their rights as citizens and abandon their work, preferring idleness and the sacrifices which idleness entails, to the degradation which injustice and insolence force upon the unresisting.

I am writing, as is my province, particularly for the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, though entirely familiar with all the acts and movements of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, which, owing to its law relating to boycotting railroads, has had special prominence in this strike. I may state, however, that the laws relating to strikes are practically the same in both brotherhoods, with the exception of the law providing for boycotts, which the Firemen's Brotherhood omits.

The strike on the Toledo, Ann Arbor and North Michigan Railroad had no extraordinary features, but the interferences of the United States judges have given it national prominence, and if the dictum of these judges is to stand as the law, the dearest rights of the citizen are swept away and an autocracy is established. This view of the situation is not strained, but is strictly in consonance with the avowals of the press throughout the country. The questions of law involved are fundamental and are commanding, as they

should command, the best thought of the nation. It has hitherto been conceded that railroad employees possessed all the rights as citizens which attached to their employers, that is to say, that if employers possessed the right to discharge employees, when it pleased them to exercise such authority, the employee also possessed the right, unchallenged, to quit work when he elected to exercise that right. If a judge of a United States Court may abolish this right of an employee, he remands him, unequivocally, to a servitude as degrading as the Spartans imposed upon their helots, and it is this phase of the strike which has aroused such intense concern and alarm.

It will not be expected that I should enter upon a discussion of the legal points involved; at best I can only voice the sentiments of a body of law-abiding men who have been trained by their organizations to respect laws and the decisions of courts, and who find themselves suddenly reduced to the condition of peonage by the decision of a United States judge. The learned judge, in his decision, finds it convenient to omit all reference to the duties of railroad magnates, and devotes his attention to employees, intimating to them that, having sought employment upon railroads, they have become, by some legal hocus-pocus, a part of its machinery to remain during the pleasure of their employer. In handing down such a judicial opinion, the judge seeks to bury out of sight the inalienable right of a railroad employee to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. If an engineer, he is welded to the throttle of his engine; if a fireman, he can lay down his pick and scoop only when his master gives him permission. The Interstate Commerce law is invoked, it is true, and the whys and wherefores of the boycott are involved, but the judge, disdaining to be exact, gives employees to understand that once becoming engineers or firemen, they part with their rights as citizens and are links in a chain gang of railroad employees, because they are in some sense public servants, and the exercise of the prerogative to quit work is productive of inconvenience. But it will be observed that no reference is made to public needs or inconvenience, when an official, without notice or warning, at his own sweet pleasure, discharges an employee.

It has been suggested that a railroad employee, when he accepts service, enlists—something after the manner of a private soldier in the regular army of the United States—placing himself under

the control of officers, from corporal to the commander of the company, regiment or division, and therefore can neither quit nor resign, but is held by some mysterious power recently discovered by a United States judge. True, it may be, that neither railroad men nor the public profess to understand clearly what the judge means, but the best efforts that have been made to comprehend his declarations lead to the conclusion that they restrict the rights of employees and indefinitely enlarge the rights of employers. For myself, I do not regret that a United States judge has forced upon public attention questions of such acknowledged gravity. The time has come for workingmen to know if they have any rights which the courts are bound to respect, or if these rights may be at any time abrogated to meet the demands of corporations or the combined capitalistic power. The United States judge at Toledo has started the controversy, and I desire to have it proceed until the unquestioned rights of railroad employees, if rights they have, are established, as also the rights of their employers.

It is asserted that railroads become common carriers, but are unable to perform their obligations without men. They must have men, and it should be stated they must have engines, fuel, water, steam, tracks, switches, etc. The locomotives and equipments can be purchased and become the property of the road, but they are useless without the men, and these, once secured, the general manager, speaking as if by authority, intimates that they become fixtures, because without them, as without engines, the obligations of the railroads cannot be performed; such is the new-fangled logic relied upon to reduce railroad trainmen to machines, to do the bidding of masters with authority conferred by a United States judge.

It is not surprising, therefore, that this strike created intense solicitude throughout the country. It is held, so far as the men can discern, and many of them are thinkers of acute penetration, that the rights of workingmen are in imminent peril. In at least one notable instance a United States judge has shown his utter contempt for a sovereign State and the laws made in conformity with the constitution, and has sent county officials to prison, because they would not disregard their oaths and obey his mandate—and it will be readily conceded, if such a high-handed outrage can be perpetrated

and the judge remain unimpeached, that a judge may, with equal impunity, subject railroad employees to autocratic indignities. Such acts on the part of judges may lead to a movement to define the limits of judicial power, since, if it is as far-reaching as I have indicated, the demand to know the worst will grow in emphasis until the worst is known, and the present is as favorable a period as will ever occur in the history of workingmen or of the country for adjustments and readjustments.

A railroad man myself, knowing by experience the duties of a locomotive fireman, and speaking as I do for an Order whose membership reaches thirty thousand men, it affords me special pleasure to place upon record the fact that the great body of these men comprehend the value of railroads to the country. They have not in the past, nor are they now, making any demands upon railroad corporations not warranted by justice and fair dealing, nor do they stand in need of any lecturing from a United States judge, or any other ermined representative of the law, to teach them their duty. These locomotive firemen are profoundly interested in the growth and expansion of American railroads, they desire their prosperity, because their own welfare is identified largely with their triumphal march; but if railroads, under the decisions of courts or any other power, are to batter down the rights and prerogatives of employees, if the workmen are to witness the creation of a cabal of petty tyrants, and find themselves shorn of privileges hitherto regarded as birthrights, then, in that case, it were better that no railroad track had ever been laid, better that the wilderness should be restored and the land given back to wild men and wild beasts.

One of the most conservative papers in the country, referring editorially to the declaration of a United States judge, says that "The decision of the United States Court at Toledo, O., to the effect that railroad employees can be compelled to perform the service for which they are employed, regardless of the orders or regulations of any labor organization, is a very important one in its bearing upon the relations of employers and employees. It makes a distinction between such workmen and those engaged in other forms of industry on the ground that their service is of a public character, and that society is particularly interested not only in the way in which they perform their duties while they continue in that service, but also in the time and circumstances

under which they quit such employment. They have not the right, Judge Ricks tells them, to choose their own time and place for terminating their service. 'Your employers owe a high duty to the public,' he says, 'which they are compelled to perform under severe penalties of the law, and they have, in turn, a higher claim upon you and your service than that due from the ordinary employee.'" And after some further comment, the remark is made that "This is a new judicial departure, and its outcome will be awaited with general interest." It is this "new departure" that contains the germ of an odious autocracy created specially for the degradation of a special class of railroad employees. No wonder that the writer declares that "its outcome will be awaited with interest." The expression "general interest" puts the case in its mildest form. The language of the judge, it would be prudent to say, creates general alarm; like the phenomena that precede cyclones and earthquakes, it presages other troubles, compared with which the Toledo strike will be insignificant.

Fortunately, it is held that the court has assumed authority which it does not possess; that its dictum is extra-judicial; that it does not possess the authority to reduce men to machines or to a commodity; that rights acquired by revolution, war and legislation cannot be crushed and overwhelmed by a District judge at his pleasure. But it so happens that while men debate such propositions, embodying self-evident truths, the court, with an iron grip, holds freemen in bondage, and the victims are as powerless as when, under another exhibition of power, men were sold at the auction block.

I am not disposed to criticise railroad corporations or railroad officials. My experience leads to the conclusion that in a majority of cases there is a disposition to deal fairly with the employees and to give prompt attention to grievances. There are exceptions, as in the case under consideration, and however few and far between these unusual cases may be, they are the ones which create the unrest in the ranks of employees. Pending final decisions the organizations involved will wait and watch, and if finally the court's decision is sustained I do not doubt that action will be taken to regain the liberties the court has trampled upon.

FRANK P. SARGENT.

IMMORTALITY AND AGNOSTICISM.

BY ELIZABETH STUART PHELPS AND JOHN BURROUGHS.

I.—"THE GATES AJAR"—TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AFTER.

BY ELIZABETH STUART PHELPS, AUTHOR OF "THE GATES AJAR," "BEYOND THE GATES," "THE GATES BETWEEN," ETC.

IT MAY be called either a disadvantage or an advantage that, when a writer has begun his career with a large or a lofty subject of discussion he is never quite "let down" from it. Nothing lower or less is expected of him, nor, indeed, is ever really tolerated in him by his public. Subjects which readily become the concern of his fellow writers are instinctively set away as foreign to his rôle in human usefulness. Any treatment on his part of the frailties or follies of human kind is looked upon reluctantly, and criticised by a kind of impulse which may, indeed, be a tribute to him from one point of view, but which has its inconveniences.

We have all sympathized with the afflictions of the literary hero of a popular extravaganza, whose first story was so unhappy a success that no editor in America could be induced to accept any other forever after from the pen of this unfortunate man. We are reminded of his difficulties—although a little remotely, to be sure—in the contemplation of the persistence with which the reading public demands from an author a repetition or renewal of his "specialty." Such a demand may be an obvious misapprehension or a clear inspiration, according to the circumstances; but it is as inevitable as the laws of success or failure, and any wise writer will defer to it as cordially as he can.

I have been led into this thought perforce by the request from THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW that I should write the paper to which these paragraphs are the prelude. "Heaven," said a publisher at a very early period of my life, "Heaven is your hobby." Comprehending fully that the writer who began with Heaven, can never be widely and distinctly understood to be a being familiar with earth, I always obey such a celestial subpœna —if one may call it so—with cordial consent.

I trust that I may be pardoned a little freer use of the personal allusion than is (perhaps my readers may bear me out) habitual with me, since the existence and history of one little book of mine is the primary cause of this paper. I am asked to express or explain my present views of the future life, as compared with those I held at the time *The Gates Ajar* was written.

At first glance it seems that nothing could be simpler, as nothing is more natural. But upon looking the demand squarely in the eye, its difficulties appear such that I have more than once laid down the page, resolved not to take it up again. Then memory took a wide and solemn tour into regions which no man knoweth save only she and the soul of her that is led into the wilderness. And thus came the pause which precedes and decides the graver work of those of us who speak to the gravest things in the hearts of our readers. And in that sober pause the eyes fill—and the soul bows. And the Angel saith unto the pen, "Write."

For the history of a belief and the history of a book may be so far one that it is impossible to disentangle them. To a certain extent this is so true of *The Gates Ajar* and of the faith of its author that no expression of that faith could be well proportioned which should ignore the fact.

The second decade and the fourth decade of life teach such different lessons, or teach the same lessons in such different ways, that no surprise would greet the writer, who in middle life should forswear the reason or the feeling of a book written at twenty years of age. And yet the loving reader of any book would be the first to feel wounded or wronged by this most natural biographical sequence. Not many years ago it fell to me to make certain inquiries (upon a topic connected with a piece of work in hand) of the eminent author of one of the most famous religious biographies of our day. The memoir had made an epoch in the spiritual history of thousands upon thousands of souls. He whose beautiful story it commemorated was of so rare a nature, and had led so lofty a life, that one considered the privilege of being his biographer a sufficient final cause for having been born, and looked upon the Christian ideals of that extraordinary subject as of necessity penetrating the soul of the memorialist—himself a religious and refined man, who had performed his sacred task with unsurpassed delicacy and sympathy. Never shall I forget the little jar and shock which I received upon reading the biographer's

letter of reply which, after courteously answering my questions, intimated that he had himself so far outgrown that epoch in his life of which the biography was the expression that he could not now call himself in full sympathy with it. Very possibly the idealization of an adoring reader overestimated the lapse—if lapse there were—but it seemed to me at the time as if he had forsworn his own soul.

In the personal case of which it is my lot to write at this time, no such shock, let me hasten to say, could await my kindest, saddest or most confiding reader. *The Gates Ajar* is not yet, and, I pray Heaven it may never be, a work forsworn. It has been the happy fate of this book to illustrate, confirm and illuminate the faith of its young writer to herself. As this paper is not an autobiography, a hint must suffice to suggest the facts which it would crowd chapters to relate, and in a few words it can be told that what I venture to call the human argument for a divine truth, as called into expression by that effort of a girl's pen, has never been overthrown by any counter conclusion of the woman's more mature and cautious religious faith.

The passionate beliefs of youth and the quiet faith of middle life cannot be formulated in the same manner or subjected to the same processes of illustration. Yet similar laws may determine both to an identical conclusion. In either case, I take it, the human argument,—or the argument from the plea of humanity for a satisfactory future life,—must be our main dependence.

The Biblical Revelation throws some light upon our future existence, and no Christian believer would incline to underrate it. But, perhaps, it is timely to say here that I do not lay quite as much stress upon this as I did in youth; having come to believe that it was not one of the primary objects of the Bible to gratify human curiosity in this direction; but by a divine reserve to stimulate both thought and trust, so far as these are affected by the final mysteries which so intimately concern all men.

The familiar proposition of Sir William Hamilton, that God is of practical interest to us only as He is the condition of our immortality, can never be too often brought to our remembrance in any fair dealing with religio-philosophical problems. The great philosopher could afford to say this brave and simple thing, not because he was great, but because he was devout and great; and the most timid of all souls in pious prisons need not fear to

follow the mental freedom of such a master. With equal simplicity and reverence it may be said that the future life is of interest to us only as it explains the mystery of this. Or, to go further :—the future life is of interest to us only as it justifies the existence of this.

We start at "fair-and-twenty," eager, ardent, imperious, hungry for happiness, petulant with fate, rebellious against anguish and grasping for hope ; arrogant to maintain that the personal factor is the conclusive one in life's mysterious problem. At forty, we stand with calmer pulse and failing heart-beat, and the sadder but stiller eye that has become acquainted with existence. We no longer demand and insist in the wrong—perhaps not even in the right—places. We do not hit out from the shoulder at fate. The longing for repose takes the place of the demand for joy, and it is easier to rest than to exact. At too hard a blow, some unexpected day, we fall ; and are surprised to find no life left in us to rise to the conflict again. In fine, the liabilities of weakness replace the temptations to be found in the assets of strength.

Our lessons are still before us, and school is not out. The higher mathematics follow the primer. It is only a new phase of the curriculum that we have to meet. Face the facts ! Life has still the best of us, and will have to the end. Give over with fighting and frenzy ; accept, and conform and obey ; for hope or despair substitute trust and patience ; but the familiar truth presents itself ; existence as a personal problem is still unsolved ; and its solution is the most imperative need which fate has left to us.

What has been called the argument of acquired human trust I have elsewhere made use of as holding to my mind the most powerful reasons for a belief in the benevolence of God. It might be said that the simple argument from accumulated human experience is the most useful one that offers itself to us for the support of a rational faith in the desirable nature of the future life. Clearly, experience has taught the happiest of us that the most important questions of our individual lots are unanswered on this side of the grave. It has long since become one of the axioms of the intellectual world that only the superficial or the thoughtless are at ease in the state which we call life. "How can any sensitive and thoughtful man permanently possess good health ?"

Longfellow once asked. "Outside, I laugh," said Dr. Holmes, "but inside I never laugh. The world is too sad."

It is not without significance that the testimony of two such fortunate and, on the whole, happy men comes instinctively to the pen's point, by way of illustrating what we are seeking to say. It is not external success and happiness but internal sensitiveness and perception which are qualified to formulate the human problem. The ignorant man pauses far behind it, like the Celtic friend who said: "As long as I get a roof over me head and clothes on me back and food in me stomach, I'm askin' no more. I've got nothin' against this world beyont." What stronger argument for a system of universal education in the next life could that simple soul advance, than was unconsciously crowded into these thirty words?

As this paper is not an essay to prove the doctrine of immortality, which is assumed for our purpose as a point already sufficiently well settled by human intelligence; so it may be said that it does not require too many pages of THE REVIEW to prove that human life, at its best, is a sad affair. Simple to triteness as this observation is, it cannot easily be offered in these days when culture and religion are both forced to an exotic warmth which it is the fashion to call optimism. It requires some courage to say, point blank, that this life is, so far as this world goes, taken as a whole, a failure. Our great-grandfathers made nothing of conceding this obvious truth. But we are wiser if not happier than they. Call it what you please, the fact remains. The human argument is the simplest and most sensible that we have for the nature of the life which we believe is to follow this. And accumulated human experience testifies all one way,—its joy and its sorrow, its success and its disappointment, its hope and its despair,—all go to prove, and, rightly looked at, equally go to prove that existence upon this earth is not a whole but a fragment. If a fragment, it must be either nebulous or meteoric; undeveloped and selected, or overdeveloped and rejected. This is simple science. It is in keeping with the whole system of things to take a choice between these two explanations of the history of our planet. Ruin or growth —dissolution or evolution—that is the alternative.

Not to pursue the point, which would be an interesting one if space permitted a little metaphysical détour, it is enough to say that this paper is written for those who are not prepared to con-

sider this as a rejected world, but as a selected one ; who believe that growth is clearly the law, and blight the accident, and who are, therefore, educated to view the fragmentary nature of this life as so much ground for expecting its future adjustment to a symmetrical whole. In truth, the trend of modern thought can never go very far beyond the simple premises of earlier and less querulous philosophy. We do not say a new thing, but we cannot say a truer than this, in short :—The incompleteness of the present life is the strongest argument that we possess for the probable completeness of another. How else are we going to account for the awful waste of material which goes on forever in our dark history ? How else explain the terrible corrosion of suffering upon sensitiveness ? How explain what otherwise were superfluous sacrifice and wanton cruelty ?

An ignorant mother puts a baby into a cooling cook-stove to keep the infant warm while she leaves the house. The father comes home, unacquainted with the circumstance, lights the fire, and roasts the child. A fireman, heroic to save life, is trapped at the top of a burning building whose roof-hydrant he has climbed to open ; seeks escape by the nearest electric cable, and is dashed eight stories to the frozen ground. The noblest man in the regiment—young, beautiful, gifted, pure and strong—crosses before the fire to help a wounded comrade, and is picked off by the shrewdest bullet in the enemy's lines. There drops the promise of more grace, more power, more high-mindedness and sensitiveness, more aspiration and achievement—more of the finest values of existence—than the whole cause of the petty war which murdered him could have compassed, if it had been won without a blow. A healthy, happy young creature on a gala day takes the train that is foredoomed to a collision ; and for thirty, forty, fifty years an invalid upon a "mattress-grave" lies staring at the walls of a coffin-room and mutters : "Why?" A motherless girl, too young for the knowledge of the tree of good and evil, errs for love, and her broken life sinks into a nameless, unforgiven and irreclaimable shame, which finds no respite till it finds the grave. A child is born without eye-sight, speech or hearing—lives to be a very old person—and patiently passes out of existence. The first sentence which the expert teaches this poor prisoner of mystery to write affirms that "God is good."

Good? If a world where such tragedies are past computation contains no promise of compensation and justification in another—no! Good? Yes, as God lives and reason is,—because mystery and misery and waste and sin shall find their justification in the happiness and the holiness of the celestial economy which death reveals.

Because this life is what it is; *because* it is a thing fatally incomplete, we have the intellectual and the moral right to expect its glad and pure completion in another state. Such being the liberal and reasonable belief of experience and maturity, one is surprised to find how easily it leads us in the direction which the fancy and the fever of youthful imagination so boldly and so imperiously took.

How naively and how trustfully the young life demanded of its Creator its soul's desire, and used the foundations of all Heaven to support that personal structure! And yet how humbly and how thoughtfully the chastened faith of middle life returns to a view of the future scarcely strange to that familiar dream.

It was no less than Aristotle who taught us that wonder was the first cause of all philosophy; and "belief," a great metaphysician has said, "always precedes knowledge." If this world is a failure, some other, let us believe, must be a success.

If, in this life, the soul is sickened by its own defects, it must in some life have strength and opportunity to cast them off. The most consuming desire known to human nature—the passion for purity—may grow out of experience of error and what theologians call repentance for sin insists upon space to exist, as much as the roots or trunk of an oak. If here we have been beaten to pieces by those varieties of suffering to which we give the safe and general name of discipline—since, presumably, man was not created for the purpose of being made miserable—relief from suffering must follow somewhere "as the night the day."

Such assumptions are along the line of the laws of development, and are as reasonable as any pure speculation needs to be.

If the heart has been broken it shall be healed. If the soul has been bruised it shall be solaced. If holy hope has been blighted it shall be brought to bloom. If aspiration has been thwarted it shall be gratified. If guilt has been sublimated into sorrow and resolve it shall be forgiven. If desolation has blasted the nature

it shall be comforted. If valuable self-sacrifice has been wasted it shall be redeemed. If the ties of home have been torn they shall be renewed.

Repair is one of the conditions of growth, and it is as rational to expect these sequences to this defective life as to expect a healthy tree to overgrow the cut of the axe, or a healthy child to recover from a bump on the forehead.

Practically, what does this mean? In point of fact, not of philosophy, what has the mature and reasonable mind to expect concerning the details of the future life? Do we discard the pleasant dreams of youth and a hopeful fancy? "Look!" cried the dying Corot, "Look! How beautiful! I have never seen such admirable landscapes!"

Even as I write this page, a letter, but just received from one of the "great unknown," whose communications haunt a writer's life, falls open at these words:

"Oh, that beautiful Heaven, where are real homes that are *warm* and do not leak like mine does!"

A scholarly essay has recently been written by one of the most eminent of living scientists, to prove that hell is a location which has been much misunderstood, and which is, in fact, an agreeable place of residence. Shall the Christian student find no reasonable ground for saying at least as much of Heaven?

Are we to have no more homes and communities and sweet neighborhoods, and the graces of arts and letters and science, and fair moods of weather and fine phases of scenery, and splendors of beauty, and raptures of fruition and surprises of achievement and comforts of love?

Do we leave them all behind us with the "piano," which was the obstinate stumbling block and cause of offense to hundreds of religious and unimaginative readers of *The Gates Ajar?*

But why?

The next world being of interest to us only so far as it justifies the existence of this, the next world clearly is bound to remedy the defects of this. One does not offer this suggestion with a breath of flippancy, but may reverently and solemnly defend and maintain it. If God is good, if the soul is personally immortal—and both of these conditions are here assumed—then the future life will atone for the errors and miseries of this, naturally, lawfully, logically and inevitably.

Individual immortality presupposes personal character, tastes, desires, demands and necessities. The goodness of God is under awful and glorious bonds to provide for them. Did He create life to be blighted, hope to be wasted, the home idea to be devastated, hearts to be broken, souls to be shrivelled, high purposes to be thrown to the winds of chance, and holiness to be misled by delusion?

In the reverent pause with which the heart answers these questions, the instinct and the habit of trust in our Creator are gently justified. If God is good, the craving of human nature for a rational, attractive and expansive future life will be satisfied. Since God is good, the wail of the shivering widow under the leaking roof is as important a factor in our argument as the rapture of the great artist whose dying eye perceived celestial landscapes unseen by mortal ken. Because God is good, all good things shall be added unto us. Beyond these old-fashioned, devout phrases the deepest philosophy cannot lead us, and need not go.

After the lapse of nearly thirty years I cannot recall without emotion the letters which fell like the drops of a storm upon the author of the little book, which has served as a text for these pages. They were the letters of the bereaved;—from all countries, all ages, all sorts and conditions of men. They came with the deep, black margins that told their story before the seal was broken. They came with pages half illegible from the stains of tears. Sometimes I used to lay them aside, awaiting a courageous moment to read through the tale of woe which even the personal blessings and affectionate prayers that loaded them could not mitigate. They were destroyed a few years ago;—and they numbered thousands. From every form and phase of misery these outcries rang—and still ring, often yet—in ears that find it impossible to forget or ignore that wail.

How shall I bear this anguish? Comfort me, for I am left desolate! Help me, for my heart is broken! Where is he whom my soul desired? Where is she who was the light of my life? Tell me, tell me that my lips shall touch my vanished child again! Prove to me that I shall find my lost and chosen friend! What is life, for I am sorely smitten? Welcome death if it bring me to my own! Hasten this which you call Heaven, if it means that which you do aver! How knew you this? Did an angel speak it in the ear? Did a spirit guide your pen? Was it a

dream of the night, or a vision of the day? How prove you this? Do you delude us with a fairy tale, or feed us with the holy faith? Do you believe what your own lips have spoken? Are you a deceiving prophet, sent to confuse the people? Or is the spirit of Almighty God upon you?—

Thus ran the sad entreaty and the stern and inspiring demand. So rang the pitiful, passionate, human outcry, day after day, year upon year—a dirge of despair, a pæan of eternal hope.

Oh, long silent voices of ten thousand unknown sufferers! Your echoes have not ceased their solemn reverberation through the humbled and deferring heart. Thirty years have not taught me higher philosophy than your litany of agony and of consolation. Upon your sacred reasonableness I rest, and to it I return. Yours was the human argument. It shall be found the Divine privilege and duty to recognize it. The Creator will not forever confuse and confound the created. Heaven alone can justify earth; and as God liveth, justification is sure.

ELIZABETH STUART PHELPS.

II.—THE DECADENCE OF THEOLOGY.

BY JOHN BURROUGHS.

THE death of Tennyson the other day with a copy of Shakespeare in his hand instead of the Bible or prayer-book, and with only his family and physician by his bedside, does not seem to have sent any shudder through the orthodox religious world. That a great poet should seek (in his last moments) to lean upon the spirit of another great poet, gone before, is natural enough, too natural, one would think, to suit the supernaturalists. Tennyson was of a profoundly religious nature, but evidently he had worked his way out of the quagmire of the theological creeds. It was a significant death-bed—science watching the body and literature ministering to the soul. Where the parish priest was we are not told. Men's thoughts, in their last hours, are turning less and less to him.

The atmosphere of our time is fast being cleared of the fumes and deadly gases that arose during the carboniferous age of the-

ology. Renan with his divine gaiety and serene reason, has been one of the forces, that has helped dispel them. Professor Huxley, in his recent volume of essays and discoveries, drives them before him like a gale from the mountains. It would hardly seem possible for any self-respecting theologian to again stand up for what is called the historicity of the New Testament miracles. Yet there be those who look upon all this with uneasiness and distrust.

"Is the spiritual sense decadent?" asks one of our current religious journals, meaning by the spiritual sense the faculty to discern the truth of the current religious dogmas. The writer is forced to the conclusion that this sense is weakening, but takes refuge in the thought that the objects of faith are like the stars in the sky which the sun (science) may obscure, but cannot blot out. It says the agnosticism of Huxley and his kind is but the confession of a child that it cannot see by morning light the moon which it saw at bed-time. The argument of the religious editor frankly admits that there is light in the world, and that it is no temporary or uncertain rush-light either, but the light of the real heavenly luminary itself.

The analogy suggested is no doubt a true one; the difference between our times and the times of our fathers is mainly in the greater light of our day, the light of exact science. We see things as they are; we see how and where the delusions of the past arose, that they were incident to the general obscurity, that these portentous forms that were so real and threatening to our fathers are either shadows or harmless inanimate objects. No doubt we have lost something—something in the direction of poetry and religion, the anthropomorphic gift. Man cannot make the world in his own image, or project himself into it as in the pre-scientific ages. Nature is not so plastic and neutral in the light of the sun as under the light of the moon. The day has its own obscurities and illusions, but they are not those of the night. Things take on less portentous forms; the eye and not the imagination rules. What power there is in mere darkness, or obscurity, itself! Take a person of unenlightened mind, and see what things he will accept, simply because they are mysterious and transcend experience. In my youth the belief in ghosts, haunted houses, witches, signs and warnings, were almost universal among country people; now there is hardly a vestige of such belief left. The change indicated

is not merely a change of weather as Cardinal Newman thought; it is a change of climate. It is the passing of one geological period into another.

The world is real, and goes its own way. The poet has a harder problem before him ; the priest has a harder problem before him, but the men who are to do the world's real work find the problem much easier,—I mean the men who are to clothe, and feed, and shelter, and warm, and transport it,—who are to fight its battles and subdue and reclaim its waste places. Science has its own mysteries and sublimities, and they have this advantage—they are real ; they are not the reflection of the mood or the fancy of the observer, they are not the result of obscurity, but of the limitations of the human mind. Knowledge outstrips imagination.

Feeling, emotion, fall helpless before the revelations of science. The height and the depth that surround us, and the power in which our lives are embosomed, which the darkness of earlier ages did not permit us to see, baffle speech. Magnitude, perspective, order, system, connection, is what the light of science reveals to us. How much sentiment, how much poetry and religion we can read in these things depends upon us. The nearness, the privacy, the fireside charm, and the dark-closet fear of nature are gone ; in short, its purpose, its affection or hatred, as directed to you and me. The universe is going its own way with no thought of us ; to keep in its currents is our life, to cross them is our death. This discovery sends the cosmic chill, with which so many of us are familiar in these days ; it makes the religious mind gasp for breath, but we must face it, and still find life sweet under its influence. The world is not yet used to the open air of this thought—the great out-of-doors of it ; we are not hardened to it. We have been so long housed in our comfortable little anthropomorphic creeds, with their artificial warmth and light, that when we are suddenly turned out of doors by this thought we experience, I say, the cosmic chill. It is quite probable that future generations, with a more robust religious sense than ours, will have a different feeling in the presence of this discovery.

Behold, what a chill, or series of chills, the religious mind has all along felt under the influence of the revelations of science. Medicine, geology, astronomy—all have convulsed the religious mind. Evolution set the teeth of both priests and laymen chattering, and many of them are chattering still. Those who have

been acclimated to the thought find new inspiration in it; their religious sense is more vigorous than before. It is like new blood poured into depleted veins.

It is beyond dispute that of the two rival or conflicting conceptions of the universe now pretty familiar to all current readers, the scientific conception and the theological conception, the one is waning or becoming feebler day by day, the other growing stronger day by day. Up to the sixteenth or seventeenth century the theological conception held almost complete possession of man's mind. Only here and there did a bold thinker like Bruno or Roger Bacon chafe under its sway. But in our time the theological conception has been so modified by science that it is hardly recognizable any more. It has been modified by the scientific conception, crowded back and lopped off here and there till but few of its real features remain. When it fully possessed men's minds, as during the long stretch of the theological ages, it cropped out in and colored every department of life and thought. Every event, every fact of history and experience, and every phenomenon of nature was seen through the medium of this conception. Out of it grew the belief in magic, alchemy, astrology, witchcraft, demoniacal possessions, sorcery, apparitions, miracles, charms, exorcisms, etc. These notions fitted perfectly with the theological conception—the conception of a world made and ruled by an anthropomorphic being. The belief in a devil or evil spirit upon whom to saddle all the mischief and disease and disasters became a necessity. How could a benevolent being do or permit these things? A devil must be bad, even if we have to make one.

Think of the time when men really believed in the devil—when they did not simply believe that they believed in him as we do nowadays, but when they believed in him as really as they believed in heat and cold, night and day, life and death; when doctors and theologians guarded their mouths while exorcising an evil spirit lest he jump down their throats. If a man inhaled a little fly by accident his reason might be unhinged by terror lest he had swallowed the devil. The King of Spain used to sleep between two monks to keep the devil off. What a dreadful hue was given to life by this belief; in what a constant state of apprehension and alarm men lived! The insane, the epileptic were of course possessed of the devil. All evil, storms, pestilence, disease, everything malodorous, was the work of evil spirits.

When the scientific conception began to awaken in many minds, not a step could it take, or cause to be taken, without a collision with the theological conception or its brood of hateful offspring. Hence arose the warfare of science with theology, which is a thrice-told tale. Lecky has written it in his history of Rationalism, Draper has written it, Andrew White has written it, and is now adding his "New Chapters."

Not one foothold has science gained without a struggle. Not one province has theology given up till it was compelled to. But step by step it has been forced to retreat, till at least four-fifths of its territory is now occupied by its great rival. Magic and sorcery, and alchemy and astrology are given up as idle dreams, witchcraft and hob-goblins, and even the good devil are delusions of our fathers. The belief in miracles is narrowed down, among Protestants, to a very small span of history, namely, the New Testament miracles, and even these will probably soon be given up. The medical practitioner no longer uses charms or amulets or fantastic remedies; he is no longer fighting against evil spirits or seeking to thwart the will of God. The devil theory of insanity only lingers here and there in a few minds but, the president of one of our colleges lately declared, in print, his belief in it.

Some of the religious journals have protested against the experiments of the government to compel rain, showing a remnant of the old theological idea that rain is a special providence. Probably the same type of mind is shocked at the audacity of the lightning-rod man; to be consistent it ought to discountenance the umbrella man as well—since to shed the electric fluid by aid of the lightning rod seems no more irreligious than to shed the aqueous fluid by aid of the umbrella. The government agents found men in Virginia who had religious scruples about spraying their grapes against the black rot, and many good people still hold to special providences in their daily lives. Prayer, especially for material good, is a survival of the old theological concept. But for all practical purposes, in medicine, in geology, in astronomy, in the daily ordering of our lives and in the springs of our natural civilization, the theological conception has been overthrown and the scientific conception has taken its place. We no longer tremble at an eclipse, or at a comet, or see in the northern lights the gleam of the fires of hell. We have learned something of the laws of storms and the causes of pesti-

lence, and have found that cleanliness is a better safeguard against fever than fasting or prayer.

But what is the scientific conception of the universe? The idea in its simplest form is implied in the statement that such and such an event or such and such a course of conduct is according to nature, or else is against nature, thereby recognizing the fact that there is an inherent order or sequence in the course of natural events. To find out this order and formulate it is the object of science, and leads to the scientific conception of the universe. To adjust our lives to it and avail ourselves of it is the success of our material civilization. In this conception the material universe is self-existent, self-governed, without beginning and without end, having no limits in time nor bounds in space. It leads us to the conviction that the sum of physical forces is constant, that the laws of causation and the conservation of energy are everywhere operative, but without initiation and without finality.

There is the same difficulty in placing limits to time, that there are in placing limits to space. Both are unthinkable. The annihilation of matter and the creation of matter *ex nihilo* are alike unthinkable. The man of science finds the order of nature rational, that is, effects are always linked with causes, that uniformity is never broken, that nothing is interpolated but follows in due course, in short that evolution and not special creation is the key to nature. It follows that man is of animal origin, that he is fitted to his environment rather than it to him, that nature befriends and furthers him when he obeys her laws, and crushes him when he crosses them. Science knows no other plan of redemption than the survival of the fittest, knows no other day of creation than this day, knows no other fall of man save the present daily fall of ignorance and vice, knows no heaven or hell save those we make for ourselves, knows no immortality save the persistence of life and force, and finally knows no God save the infinite Power that fills and floats all things.

Science does not prove that miracles or the supernatural are impossible, but it begets in the mind a conception of the universe which finds no place for these things. It discloses a harmony and a completeness which leaves no room for alien and extraneous forces. It is a complete solvent of the old notions. Theology recognized it as its mortal enemy at once and has fought it inch by inch. Every generalization of science has been so much terri-

tory wrested from theology. What a blow to it was the Copernican system of astronomy! How Newton cut under it with his law of gravitation, how Darwin with his theory of the origin of species! It has been shorn of its influence like the Pope of his temporal power, it is confided almost entirely to the region of the unverifiable, and there it is safe. It may hurl its anathemas at the man of science, it may grant or refuse future probation to the heathen, it may consign the pagan philosophers to purgatory, it may damn infants, or indorse murderers, it may call itself Calvinism, or Methodism, or Catholicism, or Millerism, and the Time Spirit will look on content. Any spiritual influence it may still have over the masses, any power to brighten and elevate men's lives science can thoroughly appreciate. But even its spiritual power is waning fast.

The principle of the unity and completeness of nature, or this perception of nature as an entity, a thing in and of itself, is comparatively a recent evolution. Our fathers had it but feebly, our remote theological ancestors not at all. But there is a growing conviction in the human mind to-day that the forces of nature are constant and adequate to all the phenomena of the visible world, and that there is no room and never has been any room for the introduction of forces extra-natural. Akin to this, and a part of it, is the feeling that any system of religion to be credible must be in line with the rest of our knowledge. That we apprehend moral, philosophical, artistic and scientific truth with our normal faculties, but religious truth with a faculty that is a special gift from some power above us and that is not in any way related to the former, is a view hostile to the scientific synthesis. Our spiritual knowledge cannot contradict our natural knowledge. Faith must supplement, not forestall reason. If the law of evolution is not continuous, and if it is not adequate to cover the whole field of human development, religious as well as scientific, then we must find the law that is.

We make a monstrosity of creation when we make it half natural and half supernatural. If religion is something that has only an accidental relation to a man's natural capacity for goodness, and sin something which has only an accidental relation to his natural defects and shortcomings, then are those things contradictory of the rest of our knowledge. Why the man of science has difficulty with the current faith is because it will not fit in

with the scheme of things which science discloses. It is an anomaly, an exception.

If a preacher were to say: "My friends, we are all brothers of the man Jesus Christ, flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone; what he felt we may feel; what he saw we may see; what he did we may do; we have in kind, though may be not in degree, the same power and capacities he had; we can live as pure, as noble, as disinterested a life as he lived; we may show, in a measure, the same meekness, gentleness, humility, unselfishness, lovingness, charity, truthfulness, brotherliness as he showed, and the coming to him means coming to our better selves, to the Jesus within us, to our capacity to be and do like him," we should understand him. He would be speaking words of soberness and truth. If he were to say that salvation by Jesus Christ meant salvation by cultivating Christ-like qualities, not the believing this or that about Christ, but by living up to the Christ-like ideal,—if he were to say these or the like things his words would be strong by the whole weight of science and of human experience. What he does say or do, is to unfold the plan of salvation, in which such terms as the council of the God-head, the fall of man, imputed guilt, vicarious atonement, etc., play the leading parts.

My orthodox brother will charge that I speak as a natural man to whom these things are foolishness. Well, the natural man has come a good way to the front these latter days. He will not be sat down on with impunity any longer. He is backed up as he has never been before. Time was when he was utterly squelched and disposed of by simply telling him that he was the natural man, one with natural forces, with the carnal, unregenerate, devil-beridden natural world, and that all good things were on the side of the extra-natural or theological man. He was a poor, lost and ruined creature—an outcast in the universe. But how are the tables turned. It is your theological man, your man of miracles and special providences, of witches and demons, of riddles and revelations, who is on the defensive now. He is stripped almost naked; he has barely a foot of ground to stand upon.

The natural man, the man of reason, has the whole of science, the enormous sum of human knowledge, the whole visible order of the universe on his side. Our civilization is his, the future is his, the stars in their courses fight for him. We have learned, if we have learned anything, that spirit loves matter, that it blooms out

of it, and that it is from within and not from without that salvation comes; that the race of man has had many saviors and must have many more. The enigmas of the old theology are exploded; religion takes its place in line with other normal forces, unfolding out of man as surely as his poetry or his art. It is natural or it is nothing. No matter how truly supernatural the devotee may think his religion, his very delusion is natural. Those poor wretches who confessed themselves witches during the witch-ridden age were the victims of a natural delusion.

In all religious matters, in fact in all subjective matters, we are fast coming to see that truth is not a fixed quantity that may be seized upon and monopolized by any sect or church. We are beginning to see even further than that. We are beginning to see that there are no distinctively religious truths—that all truth is one, that the faculties that distinguish truth from falsehood in any sphere are always one and the same. Religion is a sentiment, and is true as a sentiment—it is real, but the objects of faith may be real and they may not. They are not truths unless they are verifiable. The world within we re-create daily. The outer world is always the same. It is only our ability to deal with it that fluctuates. Hence the facts of science, so far as they are facts, are constant, while systems of ethics, religions, philosophies, theories of this or that, are in endless mutation. Pilate's question: "What is the Truth?" was not the question of a scoffer. What, indeed, is the truth about the melting and changing forms and figures we see in the cloud-land of man's moral and religious experience? That there is or can be no final truths in these matters, in the sense in which there are final truths in science, we are beginning slowly to see.

When religion imitates science and formulates a creed in which it seeks to give permanent intellectual form to its so-called truths, it takes a false step. The creed, as we see, soon pinches and must be made over new. When man draws hard and fast lines in religious matters, he soon finds himself compelled to pull down and build larger. The conception of God is being completely made over in the religious conscience of our time. As man becomes more benevolent and merciful he makes himself a more benevolent and merciful God. The God of our Puritan fathers will not do for us at all. The moral difficulties of Calvinism are getting to be as insurmountable as the intellectual difficulties of

Catholicism. The God of to-day, or the divine ideal towards which the religious conscience of our time is struggling, one may feel some liking for, but the God of the Puritans, of Calvinism, was a monster too terrible to contemplate.

We shall soon enlarge the conception of religion till we shall not use the term at all in a special or restricted sense. We shall see that all lovers of truth are lovers of God. When one pauses to look at it, what utter selfishness or selfism lies at the bottom of the old creeds—the one thought of a man to secure his personal safety from some impending danger. The soldier who is determined to come out of the battle with a whole skin is not the ideal soldier. The man of science, the truth-lover, how much more worthy his self-forgetfulness, his renunciation, which has in view no personal end whatever. The new birth of science—the dropping of all worldly and secondary ends, the absolute devotion to the truth for its own sake—is there anything more truly religious than this? Darwin cared nothing for religion, so called, because his mind and his conscience were enlisted in his science. He was serving God disinterestedly.

"Esaias is very bold and saith, I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest to them that asked not after me."

"He judged the cause of the poor and the needy; was not this to know me? saith the Lord."

JOHN BURROUGHS.

POSSIBLE REFORMATION OF THE DRINK TRAFFIC.

BY THE REV. W. S. RAINSFORD, D. D.

I have been invited to reply in the June number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW to criticisms on this article and questions arising therefrom. In undertaking to do so I wish it understood that I cannot, of course, promise to even attempt an answer to all questions that may be raised. I have no wish to pose as possessing an encyclopædic knowledge on a subject of such vast proportions and extraordinary difficulty as the drink problem. No sudden cure is possible. No radical reformation can be wrought quickly. The diseased appetites of the multitude are too deeply seated for that. In our day it is only the quack who dares to stand forth with a bunch of "all-heal" in his hand, and when he does stand forth it is only fools who listen to him long. All communication should be addressed to the Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D. D., care of NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, 3 East Fourteenth street, New York.

ANYONE suggesting the possibility of reforming and purifying the drink traffic, more specially in our large cities, places himself in a position of peculiar difficulty. At first, of necessity, his enemies are mighty and many; his supporters doubtful and few. Ranged against him are the enormous organized forces of alcohol producers and retailers. Next, come the professional politicians whose interests are bound up in many ways with the present system of saloons and corner groggeries. These places are the prolific spawning-beds for dickers and deals. Here such things are born. If they are not the offspring of the saloon, that institution serves as an excellent midwife and wet-nurse to them. It is needless to say that the ordinary temperance reformer and temperance politician cannot be induced to look favorably on any scheme of reform. He is for destroying the trade, root and branch. Here, then, are three groups of opponents, each strong in numbers and resources, each prepared to denounce and oppose with cleverness and bitterness any movement that aims at the reformation of the drink trade itself.

Yet it seems to me that it is just along this line alone that

a lasting and permanent temperance reform may be worked out. The practical reformer must sit down and count the cost; whether he will be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand; and by wise disposal of the numbers at his command make up for his inferiority of force. Here temperance agitation and agitators persistently fail. They attempt the impossible. They seek to root out alcohol, both the love of it and the use of it. They might as well seek to root out the use of beef or fish. It seems to me past argument, that in some form or another alcohol is here to stay. I do not know of any temperance movement that even attempts to meet the inevitableness of the use of alcohol squarely. The prohibitionist refuses to draw any distinction between the moderate and the immoderate drinker. All uses of his enemy are, in his view, criminal. The seller, the consumer, are in all cases public enemies to be suppressed by law. Thus the prohibitionist ignores the past of our race, and history with him counts for nothing. His position is one of fanatical hatred. Of all the obstacles that bar the way to a true reform he himself constitutes the worst.*

The coffee-house reformer provides the public with a good thing. For that portion of the community who wish to use coffee his plans are admirable. But neither coffee nor kindred beverages can take the place with the multitudes that alcohol in some form has taken for ages, and, for a long time, will continue to take.

To my mind the advocate of high license, if he gain his way, leaves the sting in the evil business still. His system permits the trade in drink to be pushed and expanded by individual capacity and for individual gain. And as, under his proposed system, licenses would be greatly reduced in number, it simply follows that those holding them would need to exercise a more thorough business capacity, would need to more thoroughly advertise and push their trade, in order to reimburse themselves for the added cost of their license. Nor can the religious reformer hope to achieve much, as long as he confines himself to the present methods in vogue in churches and missions. These deal with the *made* drunkard, while they too often ignore the causes that make him. The made drunkard can be saved, but very seldom is saved; nor

* Here I must say that I do not wish to be understood as asserting that, under certain conditions and in smaller communities, local prohibition may not do much good.

are we using, it seems to me, in approaching him as we do, chiefly on the emotional side of his nature, the most likely means to deal with his almost hopeless case.

If the foregoing is at all a fair description of the present aims and methods of temperance reform, it seems nothing less than wrong for the church to content herself any longer with such methods. It is inexcusable for Christian people to fancy that in the employment of them they have discharged their responsibility, while in the growing light of knowledge the sources and roots of the evils of intemperance, as well as the far-reaching blight engendered by them, are so much more evidently laid bare to the gaze of the student.

No present temperance move then has, it seems to me, a chance of success. A limited success, of course, they all attain, for any effort to aid our fellow man, that is honestly made, cannot altogether fail of good result. But surely the time is ripe for the entrance on this field of a class of helpers, a class of efforts, so far at least unrecognized and unorganized. I refer to that vast number of moderate-minded men, temperate people in the fullest sense, who deplore drunkenness, but who know full well that, for generations to come, we cannot hope to eliminate the drunkard. These people cannot heartily support any of the present temperance movements, for they themselves are not prepared to banish alcohol in all shapes from their lives, and they therefore feel the inconsistency of demanding that their neighbors should do so. Once move this class, once prove to them, not that the present system, under which the retail drink trade is carried on, is bad, nay, almost the worst possible—for that they know—but that they and they only have power to change and modify it, that they can modify it; and I cannot but believe that something in the way of lasting reform is at least in view.

How is this vast body of temperate opinion to be educated and fused with zeal for the public good? How is it to be educated as to what should be done and what can be done to save the multitudes from the ruin of drink? I know of no other method but that which has been employed so often and so successfully in bringing about various necessary reforms—the method of concrete example. Here and there groups of moderate people must take hold of the evil thing and try to rob it of its worst features.

No field for such effort can possibly be as unpromising as

that presented by the city of New York, where the drink power is confessedly at its worst. What can be done in New York? One thing is self-evident at the outset. The crowded nature of the city makes places of recreation and social meeting necessary. Clubs, amusement halls, restaurants, play and must continue to play a disproportionately important part in our municipal life. The working people pent up in terribly narrow quarters need such outlets more than do their richer neighbors. To these, even such a place of resort as the present saloon, with all its evils, is, taking it all in all, a boon. To close all of our ten thousand saloons, were such an act possible, without providing some other and better institutions to take their place, would be a calamity to New York and a crime against her.

But why not, it is objected, supply their places with coffee palaces, teetotums, etc.? No doubt good would follow the indefinite multiplication of such resorts. But what are we to do with the mass of the populace that demand alcohol in some shape or other? All temperance schemes simply ignore this very large majority of the working people. The day of paternalism is well nigh over. Education, and a thousand facilities for man's intercourse with man, has opened up to one class the life of the other. The liberty allowed with unquestioning accord to the rich and well-to do cannot be denied to the wage-earners. Whoever dreamed, I ask, of a first-class social club, within whose walls alcohol could not be obtained? Such a club could not exist in this city. To meet the social needs of any class we must look frankly at what those needs are, and not content ourselves with looking at what we wished they were. Nay, we must approach the question, remembering that what men believed their needs to be, these to all intents and purposes are their needs. You may set to work to change slowly that opinion as to need, and so, working from within, you eliminate the evil by educating and raising the standard of need; but this is the only way to revolutionize the social usage of any class of men. To bring about a change in any other way is hopeless.

You may convince the rich man that he does not need alcohol in his club, and then you can banish it from the club. Till you do so convince him you are only fooling yourself and wasting time in seeking to banish it by restriction. You may convince the working people that they are better without alcohol, and so

induce them to forego its use ; but till you have wrought this change, any scheme of social recreation, any plan for providing places of public entertainment, that shall be in the best sense popular, that shall be acceptable to the masses, is, I say, a chimera, a waste of energy, and an exercise of an unwise and hurtful paternalism. However well-meant, it cannot reach those most in need of aid.

I criticise present temperance methods, then, not because they have not achieved good, but because they have not and cannot cover the whole field of reform. They have done something in educating the public mind ; but we have arrived at a stage in our development where the intemperate advocacy of intemperate temperance is fatal to the best result. Much further I think we cannot go, if we do not win the hearty coöperation of the unused and unorganized forces of moderation. We are very far indeed from being in a position to speak authoritatively on all sides of the drink problem. Rum has been made responsible for more than its admittedly large share of human wretchedness. The necessary data are hard to procure, and the temptation to deal with them in not the most honest fashion is very strong. Account for it as you will, the moderate opinion of the country is profoundly distrustful of statements made by the advocates of temperance ; and yet it is, I think, becoming more and more convinced of the need of scientific knowledge, and more willing to lend a hand in a great work, when the path of duty shall be made plain.

The present saloon embodies, as all know, the worst features of the trade. It is contrived to push the sale of drink and little else but drink. I may be here accused of exaggeration. Some will remind me of the variety, sometimes great, of foods provided at the saloon counter. And I admit that this is measurably true of the better class of saloons ; for the large profit of the present saloon-keeper, when his business is well established, enables him to provide a tempting lunch at or below cost, as well as to pay for his license and to meet other illegitimate charges in the shape of assessments. This being so, it only proves how important to the head of the establishment, under the present system, is the sale of that drink on which alone profit is reaped. His lunches and everything about his place are cunningly contrived by the saloon-keeper as lures to drink. If, as is sometimes unquestionably the case, the

saloon-keeper uses his influence when he can to check drunkenness, he is certainly the most remarkable instance in modern life of the capacity of strong character to triumph over environment, to rise superior to the instincts of professionalism. To reform the trade, we must seek to alter the very nature of the present drink resort. Its life and mainspring are now private profit. No trade makes so large a return, perhaps, to private enterprise. It is able to pay the brewer and distiller, the saloon-keeper himself, and the politician. Take the profit out of it and you cut its sinews of war. Leave profit in it and, I repeat, that you do not take the sting out of the evil even by reducing the number of saloons; for sharper practice, worse liquor, and more astute business methods will all be used to push the sales.

Mr. Gladstone, speaking in 1890, laid his finger on the root-evil of the present system in the following passage:

"At present, as I understand it, the case of the Government is that the number of public-houses is enormous. Yes, sir; but something else ought to be taken into consideration. Why is it that the position of the public-houses in this country of ours is lower than it is in any other country in Europe? This is the result of the management we have followed, and the number does not in the slightest degree tend to mitigate that statement. I am one of those who see the utmost, incurable, radical and profound mischief from what is called the publicans' monopoly, and not through any fault of the publican, or, indeed, of any one. My firm belief is that as long as the monopoly connected with private interests belongs to the trade, you will never have true and efficient police supervision exercised over the public-houses, and without that they must continue to hold the disparaged and unsatisfactory position which they do hold now and have held for many generations."

The saloon of the future will not only not be run for private profit; it will be shaped to meet the actual needs of the public. It will be a veritable "public-house." Drink is but one factor, we hope a decreasing factor, in the life of the people. Drink, indeed, often gains its hold because the life of its victims is so dull and flat, so utterly devoid of all legitimate amusement and recreation, that they know no other excitement, no other relaxation, than the semi-stupor, the grateful forgetfulness of creeping inebriation. Amusement, variety, aroused interest—these are the true and deadliest foes to the drink habit. If we could only get at the lives of our working people, increasing their variety, and giving them new interests, we would be doing much to loosen the hold intemperance has obtained on the wage-earners. It is evil environ-

ment that makes drink, fully as much as drink makes environment evil.

The public-house then that the people need, is no mere dram shop; but a commodious meeting-place, a club house. It must provide amusement—music certainly. It needs no standing bar. Its food supply must be plentiful, cheap, varied and well cooked. Milk, coffee, and tea, must be as much its staple trade as beer, wines, and in some cases, perhaps, spirits. It should be a directly business concern, with no savor of crankdom or religion about it. It must embody one aim and one only—the providing of reasonable and healthy amusement and opportunities for social intercourse for the masses of the people, obliged by the vicious circumstances surrounding their homes to secure some space and entertainment away from them. Any sign of philanthropy about it, or any running of it as a reforming agency, foredooms it to failure.

It will be objected that the introduction of any such reforms as these in the drink trade require legislation. In time, when the public are educated more thoroughly on this subject, legislation and legislation of a very thorough sort will be demanded. The intemperate nature of the legislation that has so far been pushed has postponed the day of wise and truly temperate enactments; but that day must come. Sooner or later it will become evident that it is in the highest degree unwise and inexpedient to leave the sale of alcohol in private hands; to permit its manufacture and distribution to be a matter of private enterprise. Some such regulative system as that adopted in Sweden and Norway, where within fifteen years the total sales of spirits has been reduced by one-half, or some improvement on that system, will be adopted here. But pending such a time we can, by concrete example, do much to educate the public as to the most likely methods bywhich this better state of things may be brought about.

Let me remind all who are disposed to condemn as impossible and hopeless any such attempt to widen the field of Christian responsibility, so that it would include this drink question, that a limited class of persons has most effectually rendered this very service to the community, and is rendering it even now. There are a comparatively small body of people who are always ready to devote themselves to a difficult and unpopular task, and who know that final success must, of necessity, be preceded by many failures. These people are almost invariably members of Chris-

tian churches; and so it naturally comes to pass that the impetus for such a movement as I suggest must be sought within the churches themselves. Of course I do not advocate, nor have I advocated, the churches as corporations going into the liquor business. This would be both absurd and impossible. As corporations, the churches cannot take hold of any of the social problems that we deal with—the problems of education, of lodging the poor, of organized charity. And yet in each of these fields of necessary reform the churches have led the way in the instruction of the public by methods of concrete example. As an instance it may be noted that very soon it will be impossible to find a large number of little children over three years old wandering our sidewalks and crawling on the door steps, while they drink in the moral and physical diseases of the slums. Why? Because years ago a few—a very few at first—saw the evils consequent on wasted childhood, and there and then planted kindergartens. They were few and far between, dependent on voluntary support, and of course utterly inadequate to the needs of the districts in which they were situated. Yet see what they have done. These few volunteer kindergartens have demonstrated by a concrete example the needs of our children, and our public-school system must soon be made to include a complete system of kindergartens.

Not only in the vital matter of education for the children do we owe much to private enterprise; in almost all departments of our social life it prepares the way of reform, temporarily and very partially occupying the ground, grappling with problems that later on must be taken up by the State.

It seems then altogether timely and wise that groups of people in our large cities should establish "public-houses" where alcohol is sold along with all other foods and drinks that the public need. Such resorts would compete with the saloons, and would do much to cheer the sadly monotonous lives of a large part of our city population. They would have some share in hastening a better time, when an intelligent judgment of the whole of this immensely difficult question will be possible to us; and when the dangers and evils of the drink traffic shall be reduced to a minimum, either by placing the whole trade under honest and independent government supervision, or in the hands of trusted citizens pledged by the terms of their license to make no personal profit.

W. S. RAINSFORD.

WHICH IS THE BEST FORM OF LIFE INSURANCE?

I.—THE NATURAL-PREMIUM SYSTEM.

BY GEORGE A. LITCHFIELD, PRESIDENT OF THE MASSACHUSETTS BENEFIT LIFE ASSOCIATION.

THE possibilities of pure life insurance are necessarily limited. It may fairly be said that they are embraced in the simple proposition: How best to indemnify against loss occasioned by the death of one whose life is of pecuniary value to another. Safe and certain indemnification at the least possible financial outlay is the end sought. The thrifty wage-earner receives, we will say, one thousand dollars in exchange for his toil, whether of brain or brawn, for a period of one year. The family is thus comfortably provided for. But the thought of death, and of the possibility of the family being subjected to want, occurs to the wage-earner. The thought is disquieting. He casts about for some relief. He thinks of investments, but he has little to invest, and it would take many years for that little, however well invested, to afford an income commensurate with what is liable to be an immediate necessity to those dependent on him. Manifestly what he needs is at once to make available to his dependants, in the event of his death, an income that shall, in part at least, make good to them the loss of his earnings. By a little calculation he finds that his life represents a capital larger than he had supposed. He finds that it would require twenty thousand dollars, invested at five per cent., to produce a sum annually equal to his earnings. Just here the value of pure life insurance is apparent. The first question with him now is, how much of his income can he afford to set aside for the purchase of life insurance, and the second is, how much life insurance will that sum purchase?

He is not a capitalist. He has nothing that represents capital but his life and health applied in the form of productive labor.

He is not seeking investment. He has no money to put into banking. What money he can spare from the necessities of daily life must be applied to secure the largest indemnity to those who will suffer loss if he dies. Capitalists may speculate with, or invest in any form they please, their surplus funds, but he has no surplus funds to invest; he must buy simple indemnity against the loss that would be occasioned by his death. It is of prime importance with him to know where he can buy safe indemnity at the least possible outlay.

Life insurance may form a co-partnership with banking, but banking is not, and never can be, life insurance. We maintain, therefore, that there are no possibilities in life insurance except to indemnify against the loss of pecuniary value represented by a life. How, then, can such indemnity be best secured? By combining investment or banking with life insurance? We reply, emphatically: No.

The mere statement of one or two undeniable facts will estab lish our position beyond a reasonable doubt.

First, The heavy expense incurred by level-premium life companies in the conduct of the business makes it undesirable. The late Commissioner Tarbox, of Massachusetts, speaking on this point in his report for 1885, said: "For the purposes of safe investment and honest gain a life-insurance company cannot be a fit agent, for two principal reasons: First, nearly or quite a quarter of the investment is consumed for the company's support, and is, therefore, too expensive an investment agency to be a desirable one; secondly, the company is not so well constituted to manage the investment safely and judiciously as are other institutions which administer trust funds. A company can pay out no more than its income, and as it consumes approximately a quarter of its income in expenses it certainly cannot honestly make profitable returns to its patrons however skilfully it may employ the residue of its funds in honest use."

Second, Every dollar invested above the cost of pure insurance reduces by so much the company's risk, for which the applicant pays. If the insurance cost of a risk is one hundred dollars, and the applicant couples with that another hundred dollars for investment, the company's risk is reduced by just one hundred dollars.

Third, If the policy matures by the death of the insured, he

has paid two hundred dollars for security that he might have purchased for one, and this large over-payment is increasing against him in enormous ratio, and the company is correspondingly relieved as time goes on.

Fourth, In case of failure to persist in his payments, his loss by forfeiture is very greatly increased.

Other reasons might be given, but these are sufficient for our purpose. A single other quotation from the report of Commissioner Tarbox is in point. He says: "Insurance companies refer boastfully to their great accumulations as guarantee of their strength and prosperity. But, besides what the moth may corrupt and the thief may steal, this amassed wealth is constantly environed with perils such as the best prudence cannot surely ward. Liabilities increase as funds increase, and liabilities remain, though funds be lost; while any excess over liability is not the production of the company, but tribute levied from the public. I am strongly persuaded of the impolicy and positive danger of magnifying the banking feature of life-insurance institutions, to accommodate modern plans of tontine speculation and endowment investment."

While we would emphasize the warning sounded by the eminent authority just quoted, we yield to no one in our estimate of the beneficence of pure life insurance, when divested of these extraneous growths that have attached themselves to what is known as the level-premium system of life insurance.

The question then very naturally suggests itself: "Is there a better system?" The writer believes there is, and will briefly give his reasons for this belief. The system to which we refer is known as the natural-premium system. It occupies middle ground between the high-cost-little-insurance-but-large-investment companies of the level-premium system on the one hand, and those companies that represent simple assessment insurance on the other. Whatever is valuable in either of these forms of insurance is represented in the natural-premium system, and whatever is objectionable in these forms is discarded. Advocates of the level-premium system—presumably from ignorance and not from intention—fall into grave errors in their allusions to other forms of insurance. Some of them seem utterly oblivious of the fact that natural-premium insurance represents a system, in relation to which what has been known as

assessment insurance is as the babe in swaddling clothes to the full-grown man. This is illustrated by the remarks of President Greene, in his able article in the March number of THE REVIEW. He speaks of the "make-shift schemes of the more ambitious of the assessment or natural-premium companies," and then says that they "professedly charge each year only the assessments or premiums necessary to pay the actual death losses and expenses of that year, and nothing for a reserve against the increasing mortality as their policy-holders grow older." Exactly the opposite of this is true of the "ambitious natural-premium companies." These companies lay aside from twenty-five to thirty-three and one-third per cent. of all premiums collected, to apply in the future to increasing cost from increasing age of policy-holders.

Again he says: "They do not agree to pay an absolute sum, only what they can collect by way of assessment up to, and not exceeding, a certain sum. What may be realized on a policy depends wholly on the degree of success in collecting the assessment made to meet it." The exact reverse of this is true. These "ambitious natural-premium companies" write just as absolute a policy as does his own company, and are compelled to do so by the laws of the various States, Massachusetts being the first State to pass such a law. Had President Greene been indulging in a Rip Van Winkle doze for the past fourteen years, he could not have gone further from the facts as applicable to natural-premium insurance of to-day than he has done in the article from which these quotations are made.

In any radical departure from existing forms and customs, whether in the business or scientific world, there is, and must always be, the experimental stage. Gradually, however, that which is valuable secures public recognition and support.

While the natural-premium system of life insurance to-day is the outgrowth of the assessment idea, it nevertheless represents practically a perfected system as the embodiment of the best thought of many of the best informed experts in the insurance world. Ignoring all speculative and investment features of the older system, it offers to the people pure life insurance, based upon the same great laws of life expectancy and mortality which are the foundation principles of level-premium insurance. It includes in its premium rates the same amount for mortuary pur-

poses that is charged by level-premium companies; it includes an expense cost much less, indeed, than is required by the more cumbersome level-premium system, but ample for the purpose; it provides a loading of thirty-three and one-third per cent. for a reserve fund, fully adequate, it is believed, to meet all contingencies; it writes a policy contract embracing all the valuable features of a life policy in any company; it promises to pay a definite amount upon the decease of the insured and backs up its promise with cash on hand, and differs from the level-premium system only in that it reserves the right, if its calculations shall be shown by experience at any time in the future to be in error, and that a sufficient amount has not been charged, to call upon the insured to make good such deficiency. It is not believed that such a contingency will ever occur, but if it should the integrity of the company can be preserved and every contract fully met at maturity, and no receiver will be required to take the funds of the company "to that bourne" from whence, unfortunately, they so seldom return.

The claim of President McCurdy, in his article in the March number of THE REVIEW, that the individual under the system of combined insurance with investment can make money, is, indeed, as he admits, a paradox, but in the mind of every man who understands the subject a paradox that admits of no elucidation. It is not possible for the individual insurer to make money, except by the loss of his fellow-insurers. That loss may be lessened or increased by the various conditions that enter into the problem. When from twenty to twenty-five per cent. of the entire receipts of a company are swallowed up by expenses there is no possibility of overcoming the loss so as to afford a profitable investment to the contributors as a whole, by any fortuitous circumstances, nor by any application of the principle of compound interest. The favorite device adopted by these companies is to induce the individual insurer to defer any accounting on the part of the company for as long a period as possible, for the very reason suggested by President Greene, viz., "in the hope that so many will die or lapse their policies meantime that their forfeited reserves and savings divided up among those who live and pay through will overcome the effect of extravagance on their particular policies and give them a good thing—not out of the investment capacity of the business as a whole—but out of those who have had to

drop out by the way and leave all or a part behind them." This loss of the many, least able to afford it, for the profit of the few, best able to suffer a loss, is an evil that menaces the future usefulness of these great institutions, and none know it better than those who administer their affairs.

Under the natural-premium system, pure insurance indemnity is furnished, as safe and secure as under any system, and, because of its less expensive machinery, at scarcely more than one-half the cost. Who can estimate the possibilities of such a system of life insurance, so perfectly adapted to meet the wants of the great middle classes of our people? The result thus far has been that many thousands have availed themselves of its advantages, who would have had no indemnity under any other system. It has already far outstripped the level-premium system, both in the number of its patrons and the amount of indemnity provided, and is as yet in the morning of its brilliant career, while the older system has held the field undisturbed for half a century.

GEORGE A. LITCHFIELD.

II.—THE DISADVANTAGES OF THE LEVEL-PREMIUM SYSTEM.

BY EDWARD B. HARPER, PRESIDENT OF THE MUTUAL RESERVE FUND LIFE ASSOCIATION.

THE principle underlying all insurance is that the insured are themselves the insurers, the losses or misfortunes of the few being partly made up to them by the payments of the many. The ancient Romans had their clubs, each member of which bound himself to contribute his proportion of the amount necessary to indemnify a fellow member for the loss which he might sustain; the Britons had their trade or craft guilds, by means of which the same purpose was served, the principle being extended in many cases to furnishing the necessaries of life for a member in sickness and the money to defray funeral expenses. This gave way to the Friendly Society, which was a still further extension or application of the principle, the widow and the orphans of the deceased member being included in the benefits distributed.

In the modern insurance company the principle is reduced to

a science ; the careful observation of its operations having furnished data which demonstrate that the cost of the benefits which are provided can be approximated with an accuracy which practically amounts to a certainty.

This is especially true as applied to fire, life, and accident insurance; if it were not so, insurance companies would still be in their experimental stages, and their promises, or contracts, mere speculations, which might or might not be fulfilled. The absurdity of such a theory is self-evident.

Being more familiar with the history and operation of the principle already referred to as applied to life insurance, I shall confine myself to that branch of the business.

An examination of the most reliable documents on the subject reveals the fact that the total amount of life insurance in force throughout the entire civilized world, fifty years ago, was less than our American companies now issue in one year. The following table shows the amount which old-system companies had in force in the whole world for each of the four decades :

Year.	Insurance in Force.
1861	$1,195,000,000
1871	4,247,000,000
1881	5,597,000,000
1891	9,893,000,000

On December 31, 1892, the amount of insurance in force in the whole world, held by old-system companies, was $10,680,-000,000. At the close of the same year assessment companies and fraternal orders had outstanding insurance to the amount of over $7,000,000,000, ninety per cent. of which was on the lives of persons residing in the United States.

In 1878 the total insurance in force, on the assessment plan, was a little over $125,000,000, and as the amount in force is now more than $7,000,000,000, the increase during the fifteen years exceeded 500 per cent. The new business written by assessment associations and fraternal orders alone, in 1892, exceeded the total amount of insurance in force in the whole world fifty years ago. Less than fifty years ago friendly societies were not only without the protection of law, but were maligned by both pulpit and press, articles having frequently appeared in the London *Times* and other influential papers grossly misrepresenting such world-renowned and beneficent institutions as the Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows and the Ancient Order of Foresters.

An idea of what friendly societies have accomplished may be formed from the fact that within a period of less than fifty years over 150,000 widowed families have been assisted, to the extent of nearly $40,000,000, by the Odd Fellows and Foresters alone. The payments by such organizations now amount to many millions of dollars every year, and instead of being denounced as they were formerly, friendly societies, life insurance companies and associations are to-day heartily supported by the governments of all civilized countries, pulpit and press alike uniting in advocating their claims to public confidence.

In the year 1891 alone level-premium and assessment organizations paid policy-holders nearly $150,000,000. In order that the reader may be able to form some idea of this amount of money I have reduced the calculations to the sum paid weekly, which is $2,884,615. The amount paid daily is $410,958. The amount paid by life insurance companies in death claims averages from three to four hundred per cent. in excess of the money which the representatives of the deceased would have received had they invested the same amount with banks or other financial institutions.

Another point of great importance in connection with life insurance, is that the small payments required to keep the policy in force, if not expended in this way, would go for luxuries in the way of clothing, in travelling or other expenses, and would therefore not be to the credit of the estate at the death of the owner. In all such cases it is self-evident that the money paid by the insurance company is clear profit so far as the representatives of the deceased are concerned. Who can estimate the good which the hundred millions paid in death claims in America alone, each year, accomplishes? Let the tens of thousands of widows and the hundreds of thousands of orphans answer. The life-insurance policy, in far too many cases, is all that the widow has for her own and her orphaned children's support.

In 1843, when friendly societies were looked upon in England as objectionable institutions and were opposed by the pulpit and the press, no less than 1,546,000 persons, *i. e.*, nine and one-half per cent. of the then population, received relief through the government. In 1885 the paupers of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland only numbered 982,000, or only about two and one-half per cent. of the population. There can be no doubt that the change was due, to a very large extent, to the influence

which life insurance had in educating the people to provide for their loved ones, and in teaching them to practise economy and self-reliance —a conclusion which is confirmed by the statement made by the Registrar-General for Great Britain and Ireland a few years ago, viz., that "Friendly societies saved the nation over $10,000,000 annually in poor rates alone."

There are advantages other than the protection of the widow and the orphan which have been indicated by other articles in this series.

Of course the history of insurance has its seamy side, but reviewing the facts, and taking into consideration the progress which life insurance has made, and the safeguards with which it is now surrounded, there is every reason to believe that the next half-century will witness a degree of prosperity and progress far beyond anything which we can anticipate. The field force of life-insurance companies is of comparatively modern origin and is now a mighty power in advocating its claims; while the literature, which is being circulated, is educating the public and will in time produce great results. The social demands which are made upon the business men of to-day are such that life insurance has become an absolute necessity, and its benefits are being more fully appreciated every year. All classes are now interested in the subject, a result which has been brought about to a very large extent by the rivalry which exists between the representatives of level-premium and assessment companies. The field of operation is large enough to tax the energies of both systems; there has therefore been no necessity for conflict. The men controlling the level-premium companies, who have waged the war, have been their own worst enemies. Their system, if properly conducted, can join hands with the assessment or natural-premium system, and the two unite in the work of providing for the widow and the orphan and in the encouragement of thrift. economy, and prudence.

But it seems to me that it is absolutely impossible for companies furnishing life insurance under the level-premium system to combine security and economy. The law under which they are doing business compels them to have to the credit of all existing policies about fifty per cent. of the premiums which have been paid on them, and which must earn at least four per cent. interest. The money so held is called the "Legal Reserve." No part of

the reserve belonging to existing policies can be used in the payment of current death claims; and should the death rate be excessive or the company unfortunate in its investments, and the "Legal Reserve" impaired, the company would be declared insolvent and it could not legally write any more new business while the impairment lasted.

During the past twenty years, policy-holders have lost millions of dollars of "Legal Reserves" through the failure of companies which, at the time of their failure, had an income of nearly $3.00 to every $1.00 required for current expenditure. The "Legal Reserve" of such companies, however, had become impaired and therefore they were technically and legally insolvent, and had no alternative but a receiver. The history of the Old Charter Oak is an example of the danger which menaces all companies subject to the "Legal Reserve" regulations. The investment and careful management of the enormous sums, which level-premium companies are now carrying, is already becoming a matter of grave consideration and it requires no profound wisdom to see that the time will come when the "Legal Reserve" requirements of the level-premium system must be modified. Level-premium companies are, by reason of the "Legal Reserve" requirements, self-destructive—the larger they become the greater the danger of insolvency.

It appears, from the New York insurance report for 1891, that the level-premium companies doing business in the State of New York had on the 31st of December, 1891, $711,281,782 in "Legal Reserves" and a total of $3,861,584,383 of insurance in force. If $3,861,584,383 of outstanding insurance requires $711,281,782 of reserves, it follows that it would require at least $7,000,000,000 to carry $40,000,000,000 of insurance.

In a little over thirty years the insurance in force has increased from less than $2,000,000,000 to over $17,000,000,000. If a like increase is experienced for the next thirty years, the insurance in force will then exceed $130,000,000,000.

The safe investment, at the standard rate of interest, of the "Legal Reserve" necessary, under the level-premium system, to carry such an enormous amount of insurance is practically impossible, and therefore it could not be furnished by level-premium companies alone, circumscribed in their operations as they are by "Legal Reserve" requirements.

The superiority of the natural-premium or assessment system lies in the fact that, while it furnishes insurance at about one-half the rates which old system companies are compelled to charge, it also provides absolute security for the payment of its death losses. Every policy-holder, so long as he continues to profit by the protection furnished, must contribute his proportion of the amount required for death losses and expenses. Consequently, the greater the amount of insurance in force the greater the security; if the premium is not paid when due the policy lapses and the liability ceases. The reserve of companies conducted upon this system is therefore practically unlimited, it entails no expenses for management and can never be squandered in the payment of high salaries or lost in unprofitable investments. In many respects the reserve of the natural-premium or assessment system is like the reserve force of a nation such as the United States; where there is practically no standing army, but where the State has the power, in case it is required, to call out every man who is over eighteen and under forty-five years of age. That such a reserve is amply sufficient for the protection of the American people history has most satisfactorily demonstrated.

A natural-premium or assessment company having a sufficient number of members to take advantage of the law of averages, as applied to its mortality experience, and which makes all its premiums payable within fixed dates, say bi-monthly or quarterly, and has a greater amount of surplus funds than the maximum sum which experience shows will be required for the payment of its death losses, between the dates on which its premiums are payable, furnishes security for the payment of its death losses unsurpassed by any other system of insurance in existence.

EDWARD B. HARPER.

THE HAWAIIAN SITUATION.

BY THEOPHILUS HARRIS DAVIES, PERSONAL GUARDIAN OF H. R. H. THE PRINCESS KAIULANI OF HAWAII.

I HAVE been asked to contribute a short paper upon the Hawaiian situation, especially from the standpoint which may be supposed to have led to the recent mission of the Princess Kaiulani, accompanied by myself as her guardian, to Washington.

This mission was neither more nor less than an unofficial but very emphatic protest against the errand of the five Hawaiian Commissioners to Washington. I will, therefore, go straight to my subject, and assume that my readers have already seen the article which appeared in the March number of this REVIEW, from the pen of Mr. Thurston, Chairman of the Commission.

That gentleman is described as "ex-Prime Minister of Hawaii, and Chairman of the Hawaiian Annexation Commission." It is important to observe that Mr. Thurston became Prime Minister by the appointment of the Hawaiian Sovereign, under authority of the Hawaiian Constitution; and that the Annexation Commission, of which he is now Chairman, was constituted in defiance of the Sovereign, and of the Constitution, and of the people of Hawaii.

In 1887 Mr. Thurston and Mr. Dole, now President of the Provisional Government, were largely instrumental in preparing the Constitution under which Mr. Thurston became Premier and Mr. Dole Justice of the Supreme Court, and under which Liliuokalani afterwards became sovereign. The Queen and all the five Commissioners are under oath to support that Constitution, and there is no power that can absolve them from that oath except the Hawaiian nation, or its conquerors. But the Commissioners dare not to-day ask the Hawaiian people to sanction the scheme which has brought them to Washington.

On page 270 Mr. Thurston quotes Mr. Blaine's reply to

the question "How would the United States Government receive an application for annexation?" as follows: "I consider that the acquisition of the islands is of so great importance to the United States that I cannot conceive of such a proposition being refused."

I would very much like to ask Mr. Thurston: "Who put that question to Mr. Blaine, and who authorized the question?"

Queen Liliuokalani was well aware of the compromising position which some Hawaiian officials have assumed, and she and her people have been for many months in a state of alarm and suspicion because of the open advocacy of schemes against the independence of the kingdom.

In October and November of last year, when I happened to be in Honolulu, this question of the independence of the islands was so much discussed, and the autonomy was so publicly threatened, that I am able to quote the following sentence from a letter of mine which was published at the time:

"An impression has been conveyed to the newspapers and the statesmen of other countries that there are men of influence in this country who would be willing to see part of the Hawaiian territory ceded to the United States in return for pecuniary advantages. A suspicion of disloyalty and infidelity has gathered around some of those who ought to be directing Hawaiian affairs, and they have not only lost their own influence, but have played into the hands of worse men, who have at least wit enough to be loyal. We foreigners must so think, and so speak, and so act, as to inspire the Hawaiians—sovereign and people—with confidence in the friendship we profess, making them feel that this flag has no more faithful friends than we who live under its folds."

I saw then that the Queen was getting more and more under the influence of bad advisers, whilst the men who represented the intelligence and industry, and even the integrity of the country, were becoming more and more entangled in the meshes of disloyalty, under the guidance of those who ought to have been leading, instead of abandoning, the Hawaiian nationality which they had sworn to uphold.

I do not deny that there has been very grave cause for dissatisfaction with the legislation and government of the Queen. On the other hand many of her foreign subjects of the better class have shown little patriotism and less tact in the way in which they have met their difficulties. When the Queen knew that some of her white statesmen were not above secretly discussing with the

civil and naval authorities of a foreign power the mode in which they could best attack the autonomy of the kingdom, is it any wonder that she helplessly strove to recover, even by the impossible means of a new Constitution, the power which these men seemed to her to be using to her country's ruin?

I have thus far endeavored to portray the condition which existed early in December when I left Honolulu.

On one side an ill-advised queen, seeking by intrigue and by unwise, if not disreputable, alliances to save her nationality, but supported by the passionate instincts of nearly the whole Hawaiian people; and on the other side a foreign population, who had in many cases assumed the duties of citizenship without realizing the extent of its responsibilities, and who proclaimed that the commercial interests of the foreign-born must outweigh the national interests of the Hawaiian-born citizen.

We will now revert to Mr. Thurston's article. In perusing the article itself I do not find a single reference to the advantages which are to accrue to the Hawaiian people from the step which it is the object of the Commission to accomplish. The argument is that, under the recent legislation of the United States and Hawaii, American citizens have become so prosperous there that it is the duty of the United States to protect them in that prosperity; and that duty is being urged, not by the Hawaiians themselves, but by the representatives of the very citizens whose prosperity is thus affirmed.

There is no reference to bad government, but in good, honest English Mr. Thurston states (page 280): "American property interests in Hawaii have become so great that it is no longer a simple question of political advantage to the United States, *or of charity or justice to a weak neighbor,* which the authorities at Washington have to deal with; but it is a question involving the fortunes of thousands of their own flesh and blood, and millions of dollars' worth of their own property."

The italics are mine, but those are the words addressed by a Hawaiian statesman to the American people!

I think I have made it perfectly clear that no arguments have been so much as referred to as regards the interests of Hawaiians themselves, and notwithstanding the alleged bad government, the Americans and other foreigners, according to Mr. Thurston, have been fairly prosperous under Hawaiian rule. But about the 12th

of January, the Queen, with an infatuation which is incredible, accomplished three bad acts, and attempted one unconstitutional act. There was a remedy, and a very proper one; all good men should have stood by the Constitution, and let the Queen see that although she might break her own sovereignty she could not break the Constitution. In order to avoid anarchy the succession to the throne is constitutionally provided for, and in this case the dethronement of the Queen involved automatically the succession of the Princess Kaiulani. With the view of freeing the Princess from any bad court influences and giving her a pure, home training, she was sent (I believe at Mr. Thurston's suggestion) to a quiet English country home, where, and at Brighton, she has spent three or four years in refined society and study; and this year the Princess was to return to Hawaii, after making a prolonged visit to the United States.

If all that was wanted was good government I cannot conceive any better provision than the Constitution placed in the hands of the provisional government. Dethronement of the Queen substituted a well-educated, high-principled girl, who would have been guided by such men as are now the executive of the provisional government. But that was not thorough enough for the extreme men, and so this Commission was hurried off, the Constitution hopelessly defied, and the Hawaiian nation is at present being held by the throat until the Commissioners can induce the United States Government to take the unenviable task off their hands.

I ventured to write to the Hawaiian Minister at Washington, on receipt of the news, earnestly and solemnly remonstrating against this procedure. I pointed out the utter impossibility of the Commission's ever obtaining the sanction of the Hawaiian people to their proposal, and I reminded him that the Princess Kaiulani was eminently qualified for the position which, in case of the Queen's removal, would be hers by right. My efforts were in vain, for after my letter had been referred to the Commission, I merely received by cable the singular message: "Islands trans ferred; Princess provided for."

Even then I felt certain that neither the government nor the people of the United States had any idea of the actual circumstances in which it was sought to involve them. I knew that at

some time or other the fact would have to be disclosed, that out of 14,000 electors at least 10,000 would be utterly averse to annexation; and I knew the American people well enough to feel assured that they would reject with scorn the proposal that they should thus violate their own pledge of friendship, especially to a weak nation.

It has been represented that in coming to Washington Princess Kaiulani has been actuated by ambition or avarice. It was not a very courageous suggestion, neither is it true. Hopeless as the effort seemed at that time the Princess said to me: "Perhaps if I do not go the Hawaiians will say to me hereafter, 'You might have saved us, and you did not try.'" And so we came.

I deplore with all my heart the blunder into which, as I believe, panic and the clamor of agitators have hurried so many of my most valued friends in Honolulu. I rejoice to know that this is not a question between Americans and Englishmen, for all through this period of disaffection my most cordial ally at Honolulu has been, and is at present, head of the Boston house of Brewer & Co., and of the family to which Mr. Commissioner Carter belongs. But I rejoice above all in the experience of recent weeks, which has confirmed what I knew before, that the statesmen at Washington and the great American republic would refuse to be hurried blindfold into an act for which I verily believe there has been no precedent since the partition of Poland.

I have not referred to the skilful but rather unworthy insinuation that if the United States does not seize Hawaii some other nation will do so. I do not believe that any other nation would accept the islands as a gift; and I am very certain that no nation under the sun could get the islands at present with the consent of the people. If the United States desires to have them, some day she will probably get them in an honorable way, without recourse to fraud or violence; but if (as Mr. George Ticknor Curtis argues in the paper following Mr. Thurston's) the United States does not for her own sake want to annex Hawaii, then the resources of statesmanship are surely equal to meeting Mr. Thurston's ingenious warning, by providing that in no circumstances shall the neutrality of Hawaii ever be imperilled.

I cannot close without taking note of the wide divergence between the American and Hawaiian statesmen in their respective attitudes towards this matter. Mr. Blaine made it a clear con-

dition of acceptance by the United States that the said acceptance should follow only an application on the part of Hawaii; and this is the bold declaration characterizing every utterance of American statesmen which Mr. Thurston quotes. The Hawaiian statesmen on the contrary come as a commission to urge annexation, although the only condition by which the islands can be offered to the United States is that the United States shall first help the Commission to disfranchise three-fourths of the present Hawaiian electorate.

It was against this incredible proposal that the Princess Kaiulani came to Washington to protest, not by remonstrance, nor by argument, nor by official assertion (for all the official life of her country was ranged against her), but in the conviction that her presence would prove to the American people that all the truth had not been told to them.

Princess Kaiulani disclaims any right to interfere in Hawaiian politics so long as Queen Liliuokalani reigns; but should the throne become vacant by the death, abdication, or dethronement of the Queen, then Princess Kaiulani claims the succession as her constitutional right, of which she can only be deprived by force, fraud, or the will of the Hawaiian people constitutionally declared.

THEOPHILUS HARRIS DAVIES.

FOREIGN NATIONS AT THE WORLD'S FAIR.

PERSIA, BY CLARENCE ANDREWS, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PERSIA; CANADA, BY GEORGE STEWART.

I.—PERSIA.

WHEN the United States Government formally requested the official participation of foreign nations in the World's Fair, the Hon. E. Spencer Pratt, then Minister from the United States at the court of Teheran, urged the Shah to appoint a commission and to appropriate a sum of money to defray the expenses of an official exhibit and the erection of a Persian Pavilion. Only the first of these requests was granted. Every expense therefore has had to be paid by the commissioners themselves, or by the exhibitors.

The Persians are a commercial race, but they did not see their way to sending their goods some ten thousand miles away from home, to be carried through their own country on pack animals over the worst roads in the world to the sea coast, whence, having paid an export duty of from five to ten per cent. *ad valorem*, they would sail away in ships to that indefinite country known to Persians as "Yanki Dunya," which, as far as they know, has no manufactures to send in return. For it must be explained that the imports into Persia, amounting to over $20,000,000 per annum, are almost entirely in the hands of Russian and British merchants. American manufactures are unknown owing to the wise and beneficent policy of a government which has considered it a paternal duty to prevent its citizens from competing with rivals in foreign countries. Thus the raw material, the natural products of Persia, numerous, interesting and diversified as they must naturally be in a country which possesses every climate, including torrid heat and eternal snow, will not be on view, but in other respects our exhibit will be the gainer. It will appeal to the artistic eye and to the æsthetic sense alone, as an incomplete enumeration of the articles therein contained will show.

Art in Persia has existed in its present form from the time of the "Four Ancient Monarchies," of which she is now the only one existing. Conquered as she was, first by Alexander, and subsequently by the Moguls, Arabs and Afghans, yet always ab-

sorbing her conquerors, the arts were little changed. Before the time of Alexander they had reached a degree of perfection in sculpture and architecture, as is witnessed in the ruins of Persepolis, which has never been surpassed. Few specimens of art prior to the Arab conquest now remain. The ornamental tiles so valued for their beautiful metallic lustre, used to decorate the walls and domes of mosques, will be represented in our exhibit by some rare and priceless examples. This art has been completely lost since the middle of the sixteenth century.

Arms and armor will form a conspicuous feature of the exhibit. Even to-day, when body armor is no longer in use except in the religious tragedies of the Shiah martyrs and for ornament, the armorers of Ispahan are as expert in damascening, engraving, and inlaying in gold and silver as in the days of Shah Abbas.

Copper, bronze and brass utensils, such as ewers, basins, kalyans or water pipes, always decorated and engraved, will show the artistic temperament of a people who highly beautify articles of daily use. In painting, on a miniature scale, the Persians also excel, and here will be found specimens of papier-maché writing-cases, book-cases, small wooden boxes ornamented with pictures of figures, landscapes, battles, portraits, etc. But it is in their textile fabrics that the Persians have been most famed for so many centuries, and the rugs and carpets still produced by them are the most beautiful in the world. This department therefore will be the most extensive and complete exhibit of all rugs, ancient and modern, in silk, wool and hair, from the priceless prayer rug from the holy mosque wherein no Christian has ever penetrated, to the ordinary but still artistic "Kali" or pile carpet, and the "Do-ru" used in travelling, and spread by the roadside during the halts for tea and pipes. These carpets of every description are made entirely by hand without the use of any machinery ; the loom is simply a frame on which the warp is stretched. Natives, weaving carpets, will form an instructive object-lesson to the visitors.

The shawls of Kerman are equal to those of Cashmere, and somewhat similar in pattern. Besides the ordinary long shawls used for the tunics of men and women, some in plain colors are richly ornamented with needle-work. Woven silk, cloths and velvets, ornamented with designs in gold thread ; embroidery in gold and silver used for saddle cloths, holster covers, etc.; a fa-

mous kind of embroidery and patch-work from Resht, block printed calicoes from Ispahan, inlaid wood-work and silverware from Shiraz, belts and pipe bowls inlaid with turquoises; specimens of all these will be displayed in the exhibit.

Through the courtesy of the Director General of the Exposition and the officials in charge of the distribution of space, who recognized the attractive features of the proposed building and exhibit, an allotment of 1,800 feet was made in the southeast corner of the main building of Manufactures and Liberal Arts, adjoining that of Spain, it being one of the most desirable spaces obtainable. The Imperial Persian Pavilion is being erected from designs furnished partly by the Commissioner-General, Hon. E. Spencer Pratt, and an architect of New York well versed in Eastern forms. This building will convey a correct idea of some of the most beautiful features of Persian architecture, and as the Hispano-Mauresque style is so similar—the Alhambra, it is said, was mostly built by Persian artisans—the juxtaposition of the two countries mentioned will produce a most harmonious effect.

Since no funds were supplied by the Persian Government the entire cost of the building, together with the expenses of the installation, transportation and collecting together of exhibits has been assumed by an enterprising Persian importer, H. H. Topakyan, and under the supervision of the Commissioners, and with the aid of their private collections of Persian objects of art, it is not too much to say that the Persian exhibition will rank among the first in the beauty of its installation and the artistic merits of the exhibits.

CLARENCE ANDREWS.

II.—CANADA.

CANADA has voted $105,000 for expenses connected with the World's Fair, and of the 500,000 square feet allotted to Great Britain and her Colonies the Dominion has applied for 110,000 square feet, all of which will be occupied.

With the exception of New Brunswick all the provinces have coöperated with the Dominion, and, at their own expense, have collected and arranged exhibits which will be shown in provincial groups. New Brunswick, however, will be represented by private exhibitors who promise a creditable show. The provinces will send economic minerals, timber, fruit, vegetables, honey,

agricultural products, some manufactures, live-stock, and educational exhibits. They will also assist the Dominion Commission in perfecting the general Canadian contribution. In addition to the articles named, Manitoba sends game birds and animals, as well as a curious exhibit illustrating the early mode of travelling by dog train and the famous Red River cart. The Northwest Territories are sending fruits, minerals, timber and a full line of their fish. Fish, wild animals and birds will form part of the exhibit from British Columbia.

In securing her space effort was made by the Canadian Executive Commissioner, Mr. Saunders, to have it, whenever practicable, adjacent to that of Great Britain. In this he was assisted by Sir Henry Wood, the Secretary to the British Commission. In the building devoted to manufactures Canada occupies 21,600 square feet, equal to 16,192 square feet net. Here will be found furs, cottons and woollens, carpets, clothing, leathers, scales and weights, stoves and ranges, furniture, terra-cotta work, paper, blank books, twines, wall-papers, stained glass, wooden-ware, perfumery, glassware, brass and iron goods, edge tools, ladies' work and a special Indian exhibit.

By order of the Department of Indian Affairs examples of the work performed by the Indians of both sexes, throughout the country, have been collected. Samples of products raised by them on their farms will appear, and a strip of land has been set apart for living representatives of some of the tribes which flourished in America when Columbus landed. Three lodges of Northwest Canadian Indians, unrepresented in the tribes of the United States, will also be on view, equipped and decked with all the paraphernalia of their savage state. Boys and girls, trained in the Industrial Schools of the Canadian Northwest, will exhibit the progress which they have made in the various crafts. Canada has enjoyed a reputation for the care with which she has managed her Indian population, and a view of her Indian Industrial Schools in action may not be without interest.

The liberal arts are represented in the Manufactures Building, 6,000 feet gross being allotted to them. This accommodation will be taken up principally with the provincial educational exhibits. In this section also will be found musical, optical and surgical instruments, besides photographs, sanitary goods, etc.

Two blocks have been allotted for the Dominion's agricultural

exhibit, the one containing 5,330 square feet net, and the other 2,450 square feet net, advantageously located, and adjoining the space occupied by Great Britain. A large trophy erected in the centre of the larger block will occupy a commanding position, and show the agricultural products raised on the Dominion Experimental Farms. A large map of the Dominion, giving the railways and settlements up to date, will also have a place here.

In the smaller block the manufactured agricultural products will be shown. They include a mammoth cheese over 22,000 pounds in weight, Canadian flour, condensed milk, biscuits, ales, porters and beer, canned meats, flax and its products, starch, maple sugar, etc. For agricultural implements Canada has 7,880 square feet net, which, after allowing for passageways, will amount to 6,204 square feet.

Great progress has been made in Canada in the manufacture of butter and cheese, more particularly the latter. The products of the Canadian dairy will be a prominent and noteworthy exhibit. Though the space has been limited in the Dairy Building to 576 square feet choice, cheeses of 1891, 1892 and 1893 will make a fine showing and give a good idea of the quality of this important Dominion export. Butter, too, is promised by the leading dairy sections.

Canada's forestry display at previous exhibitions, notably at Edinburgh in 1884, has always been remarkable for its extent and variety. It will be fuller than ever before at Chicago. The Forestry Building is supported along the front by groups of columns, each being composed of three trees with the bark preserved intact, of from 12 to 15 inches in diameter, and 25 feet long. Ontario sends five and Quebec one of these groups. The trunks will be supplied with data, showing the timber resources and other notes of the provinces from which they come. The Dominion has 4,000 feet of gross space in the Forestry Building, and this will be occupied by the timber exhibits from the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. Sections of trees, timber, hewn and sawn, in all its commercial forms ; shingles, veneers, laths, shooks, wood pulp, etc., will comprise the exhibit.

The display of fruits and vegetables will occupy 8,000 square feet of space in the Horticultural Building. A large collection has been made by the different provinces, fresh and preserved

specimens being provided. The perishable kinds, suspended in antiseptic fluids, are kept in glass jars. An idea of the extent of this exhibit may be gathered from the fact that over 3,000 glass jars of all sizes have been purchased from the leading manufacturers in the United States to contain it. Apples and pears which grow to perfection in Ontario, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, will be sent in immense quantities, while Quebec's exhibit of apples, embracing many tempting specimens, will number more than one hundred and sixty boxes. British Columbia will send two tons of choice apples, while small samples will come from New Brunswick and the Tuscarora and Rice Lake Indian Reserves. The showing of field roots and vegetables, sent from all the provinces, is important. At the opening Canada will appear to great advantage, while she expects to send large consignments of autumn fruits to take their place in the declining days of the Fair. The showing of roots and vegetables will be carried on in the same way. Native wines made from Canadian grapes will make a respectable exhibit.

In the Fisheries Building Canada will occupy a first place. On the ground floor she has 3,607 square feet, and, adjacent in the gallery, 1,350 square feet. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has got together a magnificent collection. All the provinces have lent their aid to the central authority in order that the list of food and other fish may not lack an item.

The general collections of economic minerals have been provided for by the several provinces, and these are not included in the exhibits of the geological survey department. The latter may be briefly set down as follows: 1. Stratigraphical collection of rocks from Archæan to Tertiary, about 1,400 specimens; 2. Stratigraphical collection of fossils from Cambrian to Tertiary; 3. Collection of Canadian minerals; 4. Collection of Canadian woods, showing bark and grain of wood in various sections; 5. Photographs of Canadian forest trees, framed in the wood of the tree; 6. Collection of game birds of Canada; 7. Map of the Dominion geologically colored on a scale of about 27 miles to the inch; 8. Map of the Dominion, same scale, showing the distribution of economic minerals. The rich mines of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and British Columbia will be extensively represented in the display of economic minerals. The asbestos from Quebec will attract great attention, it being of superior quality,

the fibre on a large specimen being 11½ inches long. Masses of nickel, copper, iron and coal, gold and silver ores, mica and phosphates will be exhibited in the provincial groups.

The machinery exhibit promises to be a very fair one. Among the exhibits in the building devoted to electricity, Canada, in her space of 3,000 square feet, will show an automatic telephone exchange system, illustrating some new principles. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company sends to the transportation department a full train of cars, with locomotive complete. This exhibit is very handsome, and it will stand alongside of a train of English carriages belonging to the London & Northwestern Railway, so that visitors may have the opportunity of comparing the relative styles of the two countries in car building. The Canadian Pacific Railway will also show a model of one of their large steamships, running from Vancouver to the East. This exhibit will be accompanied by photographs of the scenery along the route traversed by this great transcontinental line. The Grand Trunk Railway Company will send a model of their new tunnel under the Detroit River at Sarnia, with photographic views. The Quebec & Lake St. John Railway, the Windsor & Annapolis Railway, the Western Counties Railway and other lines will also exhibit. Carriages, carts, wagons, sleighs, boats, canoes, bicycles, etc., will be found in this department in extensive variety.

An interesting collection of paintings in oil and water colors by Canadian artists will occupy space to the extent of 2,895 square feet. Some notable exhibits will be found from Canada in the archæological and ethnological branches of scientific research, the early Indian providing many interesting objects.

Horses, cattle, sheep, swine, poultry, and dogs have been selected with the single eye to superiority of breed. Of course Canada will have her building on the ground. It will be located close by the British Building, and will command a fine view of Lake Michigan.

GEORGE STEWART.

FURTHER VIEWS OF PENSION LIST REVISION.

BY WHEELOCK G. VEAZEY, PAST COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC; REPRESENTATIVE O'NEIL, OF MASSACHUSETTS; AND REPRESENTATIVE ENLOE, OF TENNESSEE.

PAST COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF VEAZEY:

I CAN write upon the pension question only from the standpoint of the deepest sympathy with my comrades in the Army throughout the war. I saw them break from the ties and endearments of home and undergo the discomforts, the hardships, and the perils of soldier life in the field; I saw them in the great stress and strain of campaigns, on the long and exhausting march, in heat and cold and storm, weary, hungry, foot-sore, sick, no couch at night but the ground, no covering between them and the clouds; I saw them on the night watch, sleepless, faithful, vigilant; I saw them engaging in battle after battle with bravery equal to any duty or order, receiving wounds and meeting death without murmur or complaint. Amid these scenes the question often came to me: Will the country appreciate and remember what it owes to its defenders? Memory of what I then saw and thought has not faded with time. Admiration and sympathy have only increased. Pledges then made to the soldiers have to me become more sacred as the years pass. They seem to me to be more sacred than the pledges to creditors of the Republic, which I am glad have been honestly redeemed. I have never favored proposed pension legislation based on the idea of compensation for the service of the veterans. All the mines of earth do not contain sufficient of gold and silver and gems for that. The patriotism that inspired true soldiers must not have a price put upon it or be considered as having a money value. The pledge to them was in substance that neither they nor those dependent upon them should be allowed to suffer

from physical misfortunes and distresses. I believe it is the abiding conviction of the people as a whole that this pledge shall be faithfully redeemed. No political party can afford to violate it. Individuals may grumble and threaten, but the masses will be sound and firm. The pension roll may be large, but that is because the army was large, the war long continued, the campaigns severe and frequent.

The original pension laws occasioned by the war were framed on the principle of pensioning every soldier whose infirmity could be traced to his service as the cause. After twenty-nine years from the beginning of the war had elapsed, Congress enlarged the scope of pension legislation by providing in effect that a *present* disability to perform manual labor should entitle a veteran to a pension, if applied for under that particular act, without tracing the cause to his military service, the amount to be determined by the measure of his disability, but in no case to exceed twelve dollars per month. The argument was that after such lapse of time it had become impossible to prove the cause if it originated in the service; and, further, if it occurred since, a pension to one having a present physical disability to labor would be but a just fulfilment of the pledge as it was fairly understood when the enlistments took place; that it had never been the thought of the people that the volunteers of the war should become public paupers by reason of physical disability to labor for bread to eat or clothes to wear. This was the liberal interpretation which a patriotic Congress gave to what it conceived to be the fairly implied promise to the soldiers. No future Congress will ever recede from it.

Some provision may be necessary to cure past or prevent future frauds upon the law. Undoubtedly some men have obtained pensions by imposition and falsehood. Remedial statutes are seldom enacted under which fraud is not attempted and sometimes perpetrated. Amendments for the better administration of this law may become necessary, but its general provisions will never be narrowed. If radical changes occur, they will be on the line of even greater liberality, the same as we have seen in behalf of the surviving soldiers of the Mexican War.

The charge sometimes made that the old soldiers have been importunate in their demands for pensions is false if applied to them as a body. They have often been advised to make inordi-

nate demands, and have often been told that the Government has been unjust to them, and that there is no limit to their just dues; but this is the inconsiderate and extravagant talk of the enthusiast or the demagogue. The veterans as a class have made no unreasonable demands; they have asked only what would be just, in view, not of their service, which they freely gave to the country in crushing rebellion and preserving the Union, but of their physical disabilities to earn a livelihood.

There was a difference of opinion as to the form of legislation best calculated to reach this result. Some thought it should be in the form of a service pension; that is, a pension to all, but graduated in amount to each according to length of service. It was claimed that this would operate more justly than the present law, and would not be an abandonment of the disability idea, because practically all were more or less disabled by the strain and severity of the service; but, after painstaking investigation by Congressional committees, the act of 1890 was adopted. This act must result in entitling nearly all Union soldiers to a pension sooner or later, because all who escape death by acute disease or accident will naturally reach a condition of partial or total disability to perform manual labor.

Some complain of this statute because it covers the cases of those who, though physically infirm, are yet above pecuniary want. The complaint may not be wholly without force, but to make this distinction between classes would violate all precedent. Pension legislation has never favored discrimination on the score of difference in the financial ability of persons. The difficulty of securing pension laws that operate with exact justice in all cases is about as great as that encountered in framing just tax laws. Objection has always been made to compelling an applicant for a pension to prove his financial dependency or poverty as a requisite. The impression exists among those who have administered the law of 1890 that the percentage of pensioners thereunder of any considerable means is small. I have reason to believe that this is so, and, further, that the percentage of fraudulent pensioners is not large, but I agree that the law should contain such provisions as are necessary to guard against impositions.

I am not prepared to say that a better enactment than that of June, 1890, as supplementary to previous laws, could not have been passed, but having carefully watched its administration and

beneficial effects for nearly two years I think much better of it now than when it was passed, and should oppose any change that would infringe its principle. Adhere to that, but cure defects in details if the enactment has any, would be my advice. The amount of the pension roll is large, and more than some anticipated, and is likely to increase somewhat, but the advanced age of the veterans is conclusive assurance that the increase will be of short duration, and that the decrease will then be rapid.

The fact, now well established by experts, that the severe strain and great exposure largely diminished the physical resources of all soldiers who served any considerable term, should not be overlooked. This alone is sufficient to establish the soundness of the principle upon which the act of 1890 was based. That law was founded on the idea before indicated, not to pay a man for what he did as a soldier, as no amount of compensation would be adequate for that, but to give him something for that diminution of physical power to earn bread which his service caused; and for the reasons above suggested the law further provided that present disability should be sufficient to establish the right to a pension. It was a generous enactment, and this the people demanded; and if it failed to work exact and equal justice in all cases, it was a fault that could not well be obviated without great danger of denying relief in many worthy and proper cases, which were embraced by the principle on which the act was framed.

WHEELOCK G. VEAZEY.

HON. JOSEPH H. O'NEIL:

THOSE who advocate a reform in the pension system are in favor of good pensions to people who deserve and need them, but as at present administered the system has placed patriotism at a discount; it has debauched the loyal sentiments of most of the survivors of our great war for human liberty and it has reduced the treasury of the country to an almost bankrupt condition.

The demand for a reformation of the system comes just as heartily and sincerely from the real soldiers of the last war as it does from those thirty millions of people who have come upon the stage since, for they can see that the glory of the great achievements of that war is being dimmed and over-shadowed, its

great and far-reaching results forgotten in the grand scramble now apparently being made to get as much as possible out of the government.

The scramble is not being made by the men who did most of the fighting, but by the camp-followers, the coffee-coolers and the bummers, who reflected on the good name of the real soldier during the war and who now by their unceasing demands for more pensions are endangering the pensions of the worthy and deserving.

Every man wounded or diseased in the service should receive a pension commensurate with such wounds or disease, and no one from one end of the country to the other would say him nay. No man who wore the blue should want for bread. This the country has said in repeated acts of legislation, and in it all concur. Were the male pensioners on the list confined to those two classes, the amount of money required for the payment of the whole pension roll would not exceed $100,000,000, and yet the present Congress has appropriated $165,000,000, or more than one-third of the total revenue of the country. The Commissioner of Pensions asked for $172,000,000, and it is conceded by those who have investigated the matter that if the pension bureau is conducted in the same manner under Mr. Cleveland's administration as under Mr. Harrison's, with a desire to give a pension to every possible claimant under the law, the amount needed will be at least $190,000,000. Unless a halt be called it will soon reach the enormous total of $250,000,000, or one-half of the total expenses of the government.

The recent attempt by the National House of Representatives to secure some reform in the pension system was hailed with satisfaction all over the country, not only by those who never served in the army or navy during the war but by those veterans who went into the contest from motives of patriotism and who hang their heads now when they see the way in which the pension roll is being disgraced.

There is no doubt that for the first ten or fifteen years after the war the number of people who were placed on the pension roll undeservedly was very small ; the same test that is used in all other countries was applied, and no man's name was placed thereon unless he could show by indisputable evidence that he suffered from wounds received, or disease contracted in, the service. The

proofs required were very strict, and while fraudulent cases existed, their number was very small indeed.

That the country can and will pay these enormous amounts if absolutely necessary no one disputes; that a growing public sentiment exists that people are drawing pensions who are not entitled to them is not denied; that if this country became engaged in another war it could not afford to keep up such an enormous pension roll no one attempts to controvert. But while we sneer at those countries which are forced to maintain great standing armies, we are to-day paying more for pensions than any country in Europe does to maintain its military efficiency.

The whole history of the pension system since 1862 is interesting. Take the act granting artificial limbs to those losing an arm or a leg in the service. It was an act properly passed to give as good a substitute as man could make for the lost limbs. Later it was found that men who had not lost their limbs were compelled to wear surgical appliances and an act was passed to furnish them. Later, because it was claimed that the artificial limb makers recommended by the government did not furnish the best limbs, the law was amended so that the maimed soldier could receive the money as commutation and get the limb where he pleased. Then men whose arms or legs were shattered by bullets were declared to be as worthy of this commutation, their limbs being useless, as were those whose limbs were amputated. After this those whose limbs were destroyed by rheumatism demonstrated that their limbs were as useless as those whose limbs were shattered or amputated and they too came forward and demanded commutation and received it. Of course, during all this time the pensions had been gradually increased to meet the degree of their disability, so that the man whose arm is absolutely disabled from rheumatism now draws under the law $50 commutation every three years, as does the man who lost his arm in battle. So with the man whose leg has become paralyzed; he, too, draws $75 every three years, like the man who is obliged to buy an artificial limb.

In the same way have grown the laws in relation to other pensions. The laws, if strictly enforced, require that no pension shall be paid except while the disability exists. It frequently happens that during certain seasons a man is incapacitated for work; a strict compliance with the law would give him a pension only

during that season; but through the prodigality born of extravagant expenditures this has been considered too small a matter to look after, and one examination now, if passed successfully, entitles a man to a pension for life, and any attempt to take it away from him calls down on the head of the reformer the names of "rebel" and "copperhead." Yet, during General Grant's administration, pensions were not only reduced and suspended, but pensioners were required under the law to be examined at least once in two years and to pay for their own examination; yet no one questioned General Grant's friendship for the soldier.

But the system has changed since then and so has the character of the pensioners. In those days very few men were placed on the roll who did not deserve and need pensions. The patriotic spirit which induced men to leave their homes was not then extinct, and they scorned to ask compensation from the government they served for themselves as well as for posterity. But as the old guard died away and the ranks of the 360,000 dead on southern fields were increased by recruits from their wounded and diseased comrades, the skulkers who had suffered neither hardships, danger nor disease, became more powerful numerically, and they began to clamor for their rights, more liberal pensions, back pensions, re-rating laws and service pensions regardless of the question whether pensions were deserved or needed.

General Garfield believed the limit had been reached in 1880, yet for the year 1884 Congress appropriated three times the amount appropriated in his day.

Another and a growing abuse is the granting of pensions to widows. There can be no dispute as to the fact that originally pensions were intended for those widows whose husbands were killed during the war. The State of Massachusetts passed an act in 1864 granting bounties to soldiers who enlisted, and providing that if killed in the service their widows should be paid twenty dollars a month for six months only.

It is an indisputable fact that for years after the war no pension was granted to a widow unless she had been married before the close of the war, but this ruling, like all others, was broadened by prodigal acts of legislation, so that women whose husbands received a pension under the laws passed previous to 1890 can, if married previous to 1886, secure a pension of $12 a month, even though the husband when alive only drew $2 a month. If any

pensioner lives till 1939, and then marries, even then his widow will receive a pension of $8 a month.

The treasury could stand this policy if the people could not, while the former had a surplus, but it is almost a certainty that a deficiency will stare Congress in the face for 1894, and it becomes manifest that something must be done, somewhere, to relieve the people. There can be no reduction of tax burdens unless there shall be first made a reduction in the annual expenditures. That reduction should be made by cutting off unnecessary expenditures. Gratuities should be dispensed with and the actual obligations only of the government kept. The largest amount of gratuities is dispensed in the shape of pensions. The whole system should be revised, and placed on a basis of the actual pledges made when the government was in danger. The country should throw off its present debauched state in regard to pensions, and see to it that those only who deserve and who need pensions should receive them. The law in force previous to 1867 should be revived, so that no pension should be paid to any man under the dependent act of 1890 doing the work and receiving the salary of an able-bodied man in the Government service, nor to any man who is capable of earning his own living.

Pensions should be paid only to widows of soldiers who married previous to the close of the war, and who suffered cares and anxieties in common with their husbands. All but a small portion of the pensions paid to inmates of homes should be taken from them unless the balance be turned over to dependent relatives. These inmates of homes are housed, clothed and fed; they have many comforts that people in the ordinary walks of life never enjoy; the privilege of living in those homes with its comforts gives to them much more than the pensioner outside enjoys for like disability.

With the enormous growth of the pension system nearly every one admits that something must be done. The veteran deservedly pensioned cries out against the disgrace of being on the same roll with the bummers, the coffee-coolers and camp-followers who never went into a battle; the latter cry out that the soldiers served the country and the country ought to be willing to pay pensions liberally, and object to the few large pensions paid to a few officers and officers' widows. The widows who sent their husbands to battle for the Union feel justly aggrieved at

being placed on the same basis as the woman who married twenty-five years after the war was over, and who, maybe, was not born till after Appomattox; the latter declares she is entitled to a pension because she nursed her husband in his last illness. Each class has its excuse for being, and nearly all admit that the octopus must be cut somewhere, but cry out against the line being drawn on them.

A distinguished Republican ex-Governor of Massachusetts has said that President Cleveland displayed more courage in his pension vetoes than in his tariff message, for he knew where the country stood on the latter but not on the former.

The same heroic courage must be displayed now; that display should come from the same patriotic citizens who in 1861 and 1862 left their homes and occupations with no thought but their country's good; from them should come a revival of the old spirit of '61 and a call on all the veterans of the war to purge the list.

They owe it to themselves to do this as well as to their country and the deserving and needy veteran; if pensions should be confined to the classes mentioned, with the law of 1890 modified and all laws strictly in force, the expenditures for 1894 would be twenty millions less than in 1893. There would be a much larger reduction made in 1895 and in three years the expenditures would be reduced to one hundred millions. Then when those with no claim on the government bounty have been dropped from the list, as the pensioners grow older and more feeble, their pensions may be increased to meet their necessities, for a grateful country will never violate its pledges, nor allow those who patriotically responded to her call in her hour of trial to want for bread.

JOSEPH H. O'NEIL.

HON. B. A. ENLOE:

WE HAVE a pension roll carrying nearly one million names, and there are still pending before the Pension Bureau over one million claims. The expenditures for the next fiscal year will approximate to $200,000,000. These facts, stripped of details, are sufficient to challenge public attention; and to at once suggest the necessity for a careful study of the pension question with a view to reforming the abuses of the system. The Commissioner of Pensions has estimated the number of enlisted men in the Union armies from 1861 to 1865 at 2,300,000.

He says that 1,200,000 of these are still living. His report shows 687,862 pensioned as invalids, and 442,326 claiming pensions as invalids. That would give us 1,130,188 disabled, or claiming to be disabled, in a pensionable degree. We must therefore infer that only 69,812 of all that immense army are now living and free from pensionable disabilities. It is estimated that 199,000 deserted and lost their pensionable status.

The records show that 449,315 were drafted, and that 58,843 enlisted as substitutes. Neither gratitude nor contract entitles these men to pensions. Adding the drafted men, the substitutes and the deserters together, we have 707,158 to deduct from the volunteer army as not legitimate claimants on the gratitude of the Republic. Supposing the same proportion of each class to have survived, we should deduct from the 1,200,000 survivors a fraction less than one-third, say in round numbers 360,000 as not entitled to pensions. That would leave 840,000 to occupy a pensionable status, and would indicate that there are many unworthy pensioners on the rolls, or that we have already pensioned all who are legally entitled.

To revise the pension list we should undo the wrongs which have been done, both in the making and in the execution of the laws. The pension is a gratuity, not a matter of contract, and the government has the right, at any time, to change the amount of the pension or to withhold it. The President has it in his power to reform the abuses and to correct the wrongs which are due to the failure to properly execute the law. The Commissioner of Pensions is responsible to the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary is responsible to the President, but as neither the Secretary nor the President can possibly have knowledge of the details of administration in that bureau, they must rely on the Commissioner. The man who may be selected to preside over a bureau, which directs the disbursement of one-third of the revenues of the government, should be great enough to rank with the members of the Cabinet, both in ability and in character. He should be honest and able, and courageous enough to do his duty with an eye single to the public weal. He should be a judge of law and imbued with all the qualities of an honest judge; so that he would adminster the law without fear or favor.

If the Board of Pension Appeals is to be continued to review his decisions, it should be composed of men of known ability and

integrity, men who could not be approached by the "pension sharks." The Secretary should see to it that the decisions of the Board are in accord with the statutes. The medical referee should be eminent in his profession and qualified to govern the important board over which he presides. The local medical boards should be abolished and competent medical examiners should be sent out from the Pension Office to examine applicants. Special examiners in the field are not allowed to serve in the States from which they are appointed, and yet in the important matter of medical examinations the boards are composed of men who must examine their neighbors and often their patrons, with their bills for professional services too often depending on the rating given the applicant. Complaints are frequently made against these boards on the ground that members of them use their positions, not only for political purposes, but to reward friends and to punish enemies.

The entire machinery of the Pension Bureau should be reconstructed, so that it would move in perfect harmony with the will of the Commissioner. It should be lifted out of the ruts in which it has been running, and freed from the domination of the rings formed in it to promote the interests of the pension attorneys. Its files, instead of being subject to the inspection of every clerk, and to everybody who may seek access to them, should be as sacred as the files of the War Department, or of any other department of the Government. If the Commissioner construes the law correctly, and is sustained in it, he will unsettle thousands of claims which have been allowed in violation of law. The erroneous, if not dishonest, rulings of the Board of Pension Appeals on many questions will be reversed. The examination of the admitted files should follow. The Commissioner should detail a commission of pension experts from his office and have every case in the admitted files re-examined and decided in conformity with the law. Those claims which may be found to have been improperly allowed should be rejected, and the names of the pensioners dropped from the roll. This would cut off those who were pensioned under the Act of June 27, 1890, in violation of the law, and of the orders of the Secretary of the Interior. It would cut off the deserters and the men who were dishonorably discharged. It would cut off those who were pensioned under the old law for dis-

abilities resulting from injuries received while in the service, but not in the line of military duty. The application of the ordinary rules of evidence to the cases in the admitted files would also cause the rejection of a large number of claims.

The Commissioner, if in his power, should make public, in printed form, lists of pensioners, arranged by post-offices, and have such lists put up in every post-office in the United States, accompanied by a request to all persons having knowledge of any pension improperly granted to communicate the facts to the Commissioner of Pensions. These lists should give the name of the pensioner, the company and regiment in which he served, the disability on account of which the pension was granted and the amount of the pension. Where the pensioners are widows or dependent relatives, the lists should give the name and service of the soldier, with the time and cause of his death. This would bring the matter to the attention of the neighbors of pensioners, and there would be many complaints sent in to the Commissioner, calling attention to persons improperly pensioned. The Commissioner should heed these complaints when they appear to be well founded, and place the papers in the hands of special examiners for further investigation. The special examiner should be required, in such case, to visit the neighborhood where the pensioner lives; and if he has reason to believe that the claim is unjust he should be required to conduct a public examination into the facts, and report the evidence taken, together with his conclusions thereon, to the Commissioner. If the conclusions should be adverse to the claimant, and in the opinion of the Commissioner correct, he should drop the name of the pensioner from the roll, allowing him the right of appeal to the Secretary.

It is claimed by those who oppose a revision of the pension list that the saving accomplished would not equal the cost. In answer to that I will say that under General Black's administration of the Pension Office the saving effected by the special examination of cases amounted in a single year to more than one million and a half dollars over and above the costs of the force of special examiners in the field. The commission of experts should also examine the re-rated cases, many of which are known to have been increased in flagrant violation of law, and should reduce them to a proper basis. This alone would save many millions of dollars during the life of the pension list. I believe that a strict enforce-

ment of the present pension laws in the manner suggested would result in an annual saving of at least $50,000,000. The reforms suggested, if adopted, would perhaps exhaust the power of the executive officers to revise the pension list, and any additional reforms must necessarily come through Congress.

Congress will not take any steps looking to pension reform, except under compulsion from the people. Pensions ought to be restricted to those who received wounds or incurred disabilities in the service. The Dependent Pension Act of June 27, 1890, ought to be repealed; and if it is not repealed it should be so modified that pensions would only be granted under it to those who are in a dependent condition, and unable to earn a support. The rich should not be pensioned as dependents, as many of them are under that act. Men who have disabilities of post-bellum origin and are able to earn a support without manual labor should not be permitted to become public charges. Excessive pensions should be reduced, and uniformity established, so that all pensioners of equal merit, with like disabilities, would stand on an equal footing. The 3,412 foreigners who are now on the pension rolls should be dropped.

Pensions should not be paid to those who owe no allegiance to the government, and who, at the command of their sovereigns or rulers, would be bound to take up arms against it. The great majority of them no doubt came to this country during the war as mercenaries, and enlisted for the pay and bounty, and when the war ended they returned to the service of their royal masters as a matter of preference. We have reached a point where a choice must be made between an honest revision of the pension list and the overthrow of the entire system. Deserving pensioners will support a just and honest pension policy. They have nothing to fear from such a policy. The undeserving will condemn it. Demagogues have prostituted the system for political purposes until patriotism demands that the line should be drawn between honor and dishonor, between the soldier and the bummer, between the patriot and the hireling, between the pension which evinces the gratitude of the Republic to its defenders and the pension which has been unworthily or dishonestly procured. We must purge the pension roll in order to make it a roll of honor.

B. A. Enloe.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

ANCIENT AND MODERN DENTISTRY.

THE relation of the teeth to our health, comfort, and appearance, is of paramount importance. The body being a unit the impairment of one part necessarily affects the whole. We cannot have proper digestion, assimilation, and nutrition if our food is improperly introduced into the stomach. Every one should recognize this as a prequisite to sound health. It is true that food products have been so improved and are so prepared that children and invalids are enabled to digest them without the aid of mastication, but such food is not intended for vigorous people.

The period of vigor depends largely on our digestion, which in turn depends on our ability to properly grind our food before it is swallowed. That one fact alone is not sufficiently considered by our bustling civilization. We have too many business and social engagements to think of our teeth, which is frequently an excuse for their neglect, and so we suffer from this neglect when there is no reason for it.

The utility and importance of the teeth has been known since the advent of man on this planet. Just how much care and attention were given to them in the early ages we may never know. From references in the Bible we must assume that they were regarded with due consideration. Doubtless the earliest mention of the teeth in literature, which has been preserved and is accessible to all, was when Jacob, in blessing his sons, said of Judah: that "His eyes shall be red with wine and his teeth white with milk." (*Gen.* xlix., 12.) According to Biblical chronology this was in 1689 B. C. We must infer that the patriarch appreciated the beauty and cleanliness of the mouth. In *Job* (xix., 20) we read, "My bone cleaveth to my skin, and to my flesh, and I am escaped with the skin of my teeth." Hence the expression, "I escaped by the skin of my teeth." The prophet Jeremiah gave expression to a fact, which, for twenty-five hundred years, has been a note of warning to the careless, when he said: "Every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge." Acids are the most destructive to the teeth of any agents known, and most dental troubles arise from them. While resting in the "security of God's protection," David said: "Thou hast broken the teeth of the ungodly," the idea being that they were rendered harmless to do injury.

During our Civil War I knew men who were exempt from military service because they had no teeth. Paper cartridges were used, which the

soldiers would tear with their teeth in the act of loading. Being toothless, men were regarded as useless in time of battle. Some had their teeth extracted to escape military service.

While no specific data can be obtained as to the origin of dentistry, we know it was practised among the Egyptians at a very early age. Herodotus (500 B. C.), in writing of his travels through Egypt, at that time one of the greatest and most civilized countries in the world, mentions the division of medicine in that kingdom into special branches, and the existence of physicians, each of whom "applies himself to one disease only and not more. Some (physicians) are for the eyes, others for the head, others for the teeth, and others for internal disorders." It is thought that the Egyptians and Etruscans were farther advanced in the art of dentistry than any other people in that early period, for teeth filled with gold have been found in the mouths of mummies, indicating their advanced ideas. These people were the first to supply artificial substitutes in the mouth. Belzoni and others have found artificial teeth made of sycamore wood in ancient sarcophagi. The mode of fastening was by ligatures or bands of cord or gold wire, tying the substitute to its natural neighbors.

In 1885 some specimens of prehistoric dentistry were brought to this country by an English dentist of Liverpool. One was a gold plate with several human teeth attached. The specimens were found in an Etruscan tomb. The plate was ingeniously made, and I was surprised to see gold used for a base by such an ancient people. Archæological research may yet reveal things that will teach this generation. We modify, but must not flatter ourselves that we originate, all there is in dental art.

Ancient Greece is renowned as the "nursery of modern medicine." Hippocrates made a special study of the teeth. Aristotle (300 B. C.) also wrote extensively about them. Several Greek dental operators are mentioned as early as 300 B. C. Erasistratus is said to have deposited in the temple of the Delphian Apollo a leaden odontagoge, a tooth-drawer, to prove that "only those teeth ought to be removed which are loose, or relaxed, and for which a leaden instrument will suffice." Galen taught (150 A. D.) that the teeth were true bones, and declared that the canines should be called eye-teeth, because they received branches from that nerve which also supplies the eyes. Albacasis, an Arabian physician (about, 100 A. D.), gave rules for the replacement of lost teeth by substitutes, both natural and of animal bone or ivory.

These historic facts are mentioned that the reader may see that due importance was attached to the preservation of the teeth and the reconstruction of them, even in that remote period. During the mediæval period progress was made by men who gave special study to the teeth. During the seventh century many medical men in France and England published works on dentistry, but treated the subject anatomically and physiologically, rather than practically. No record can be found of anyone in America practising this specialty until the year 1766, although the population at that time was about two millions. In October of that year there arrived from England Mr. John Woofendale. This gentleman was (for that time) a regularly educated dentist, having been instructed by the dentist to George III. He remained here only two years, returning to England in 1768.* A few years later several dentists arrived here from France and England. Con-

* In the beginning of the century there were not more than 100 dentists in this country; in 1850, there were 2,925; in 1870, 7,839, and in 1892 about 20,000.

siderable progress had been made in these two countries during the seventeenth century. Previous to the introduction of porcelain teeth (first used in France in 1774 and brought to this country in 1807) substitutes for teeth were made of ivory from the hippopotamus and elephant. Besides human teeth the teeth of such animals as sheep and calves were also used.

Mr. John Greenwood, a patriot in the American Army of the Revolution, adopted dentistry as a profession in 1788. He became celebrated as the dentist of General Washington, having made several sets of teeth for him, which for neatness of execution were unsurpassed by any of European workmanship. They were carved from blocks of ivory. All animal substances, when placed in the mouth, are liable to become corroded and offensive. The teeth used and the bases on which they were attached alike being liable to this, imagine the discomfort to those who had nothing better to wear!

Since the beginning of the present century the growth of dentistry has been rapid. The place it occupies among the professions is an index to the progressive development of the times. No vocation has made more rapid advances, and the most important of these have been made within the last twenty years. The product of inventive and scientific minds has been, and is, enlisted in its interests. Among its votaries are men of broad culture, whose investigations have done much to illuminate the scientific world. The province of the dentist to-day is not circumscribed. He should be prepared to exercise the special functions of an oral surgeon, and not simply to devote his attention to the care of the teeth. Mechanical skill is an indispensable requisite, but a prerequisite to his success is a knowledge which will enable him to treat the diseases to which the mouth is subject.

In our cities dentistry is divided into specialties, the operative dentist, devoting his time and attention to the natural teeth and to oral diseases, and the mechanical dentist supplying lost teeth with mineral substitutes and mechanical devices, while extracting is frequently a special branch. It may be interesting to the public to know that there are some thirty dental colleges in this country alone.

Many of the graduates go to all parts of the world; and scores of foreigners come here to receive their dental education. The reputation of the American dentist is world wide; he seems to excel in ingenuity and manipulative ability. Dental schools are a necessity. Our early practitioners were careful to keep their secrets—from five hundred to one thousand dollars being charged the student for the privilege of office instruction. Those desiring to enter the profession were obliged to get their instruction from the leading dentists, or enter it and trust to their ingenuity, and without a knowledge of it; but to-day instruction is imparted and methods fully explained; selfish and illiberal views are no longer tolerated. Educational facilities have broken down the barriers, and enable the student to enter upon a course of professional fame with every means of acquiring knowledge from the most experienced in the land.

To protect the public from the impositions of incompetent men, who made great pretensions to proficiency, most of the States have passed legislative enactments regulating the practice of dentistry within their own borders, thus protecting the people against charlatanism. Women are graduating from the dental colleges in increasing numbers, and many of them show marked aptitude as operators. They are about forming an independent dental association for women.

Some idea may be had of the enormous demand for dental goods when we consider the number of large establishments that are in operation for the manufacture of dental mechanism and materials. One house alone has six branches, and about twelve hundred employees. While men's minds and hands are better trained than ever, dental mechanism has also been greatly perfected. Gold being the "lever that moves the world," it is also the recognized standard as a filling material for teeth. In the early days gold foil was obtained by rolling or beating coins into sheets. These were cut in pieces, torn off, and rolled between the fingers into various sizes.

Now we have gold prepared in over one hundred and fifty forms, differing in size, variety, thickness, and style. Some of these preparations are very delicate, and in the smallest size there are over 300,000 in a pound. They are ready for immediate introduction into any size cavity. Porcelain, from its color, is much in favor for front teeth.

The application of electricity is among the essentials of modern dentistry. An electric motor supplies the power where rotary motion is desired; an electro-magnetic mallet is used to condense gold; an electric mouth lamp for "illuminating" the mouth, and an electric cautery for various purposes. The mechanical appliances and the improvements in materials and methods make it possible to restore almost any mouth to healthfulness, comfort, utility and beauty. The skill of the artist is displayed to a high degree in the line of prosthetic dentistry. In the matter of naturalness teeth can be so approximated in color, shape, and size as to defy the possibility of detection. About forty millions of porcelain teeth are manufactured annually in the United States. Pure metals and minerals are used which are durable and cleanly.

Great attention is given to correcting irregularities in the teeth of growing children. A few years ago rubber bands and wooden wedges were extensively used for moving the teeth. They were exceedingly painful and annoying to the patient. The appliances for accomplishing this work are now made of gold and other metals, and the pressure being exerted by screws and springs, it is more gentle and less painful and not nearly as cumbersome.

Gentleness, patience, sympathy, cleanliness, kindness, and skill are the elements that make the successful dentist of to-day. It is gratifying to note that the advancement is not altogether along professional lines. The intelligence of the public and their appreciation of the necessity of preserving their teeth make the demand for extensive improvements and higher attainments imperative.

EDWARD H. RAYMOND, D. D. S.

DEATH AS A FACTOR IN PROGRESS

HUMANITY has a faculty for ignoring and abusing its benefactors which amounts almost to a genius. Scarcely an age can be mentioned which has not starved its Homer, poisoned its Socrates, banished its Aristides, stoned its Stephen, burned its Savonarola, or imprisoned its Galileo. Nor is this strange perversion of sentiment confined to its fellow mortals. The great, calm, stern, yet loving forces of Nature have constantly fallen under the same unjust stigma, and though we have outlived many early misconceptions or misrepresentations of most of these, a ghastly, repulsive, lying mask is still permitted to conceal the kindly, though stern features of

Pallida Mors, albeit both religion and science are striving hard to tear it away. Let us endeavor to lift up a tiny corner long enough to catch a glimpse of what lies behind it.

I regard the prevailing conception of death as false in three important particulars: First, that it is in some way an enemy of, or opposed to, life; second, that it is a process of dissipation or degeneration involving and associated with a fearful waste of energy, time and material; third, that it is a harsh, painful ordeal, from which every fibre of organic being shrinks in terror.

I am aware that my first contention will seem like a flat contradiction in terms, but a few illustrations will probably make my meaning plainer. Let us take those earliest and lowest results of formative tendencies in matter, the crystals, "the flowers of the rocks" as Ruskin beautifully calls them. Here we have individual units which for beauty, variety and definiteness of form, brilliancy of color and purity of substance, stand absolutely unrivalled in all the higher walks of life. Watch them forming and see with what certainty atom seeks atom, here a diamond, there a cube, again a prism or a rosette, each substance having its own definite, peculiar shape, with an utter disregard of all alien materials in the mass. Mark how crystal seeks crystal and proceeds to weave its own warp and woof, in column, in truncated cone, in spire, in lace-like web of slender needles, each according to its kind. See how the advance columns of the various ingredients of the mass, cut through, ride over, or yield to one another, in regular social order of rank, dependent not upon bulk or hardness but upon purity of substance and organizing power, and suppress if you can the conviction that these organisms are alive. The only thing they lack is the inherent faculty of dying. Drown and dissolve them by fluid, fuse into shapeless masses by volcano heat, and on the very earliest opportunity they will promptly and surely resume their former shape and beauty. Gentler influences they defy. So long as they exist they are indestructible, and their life time is that of the everlasting hills. Here, if anywhere in the universe, is eternal life, in the popular sense of the term, but it were better named eternal death. Crystal life is a bar of adamant to progress. Beautiful in itself it is utterly barren, inhospitable, hopeless as regards future growth. It can neither grow itself nor assist anything else to grow, save in one way, by dying. The old earth shrinks a little in cooling, and our mass of crystals is suddenly elevated from cavernous depths to the top or side of one of those long wrinkles we call mountain ranges; the sun heats it and the rains pour upon it, the frosts gnaw at its edges, until at length its vitality becomes impaired and it succumbs to the elements. The whole structure crumbling into a shapeless mass of dull, damp, colorless, lifeless clay. Here, indeed, to all appearances is the desolation of death in all its hopeless repulsiveness. But wait a moment; here comes a tiny descendant of some crystal which has stumbled upon the faculty of dying and improved thereon unto the fifty-thousandth generation, a lichen spore, drifting along the surface of the rock. It glances forlornly off from the flinty faces of the living crystals, but finds a home and a welcome at once upon the moist surface of the clay. Filmy rootlets run downward, tiny buds shoot upward, the new life has begun. It ensnares the sunlight in its emerald mesh, entangles the life vapors of the air in its web, and grows and spreads until the valley of crystal death becomes transformed into a cushion of living green in the lap of the gaunt grey granite.

But what as to further progress? The lichen is green and beautiful, but as an individual it can never develop into anything higher. Here again progress is absolutely barred by life and must call death to its aid. The lichen dies and its dust returns to the earth carrying with it the spoils of the sunlight, the air and dew to enrich the seed-bed. A hundred generations follow, each one leaving a legacy of fertility, until the soil becomes capable of sustaining a richer, stronger, higher order of plant life; whose rootlets push into every crevice and rend the solid rock; the living carpet spreads; grass, flower and shrub succeed one another in steady succession until the cold grey rocky trough is transformed into the lovely mountain glen with its myriad life. As the poet sings, the crystals have risen "on stepping-stones of their dead selves to nobler things," and of any link in the chain the inspired dictum would be equally true that "except it die it abideth alone."

But, says some one, this is all very true as to the surface of Mother Earth; but how about the deeper structures, her ribs and body bulk? Every layer of them was part of the surface at one time, and the more intimately death has entered into their composition, the more highly organized the corpses of which they are composed, and the more useful and important they are. Come back with me a few million years to the great tree-fern period, and gaze upon the matted jungle of frond and stem thirty to sixty feet in height which covers mile after mile of swamp. Here indeed is life in all its glory, yet it is a living shroud. No hum is there of insect life or twitter of birds that build their nests in the branches; for there is neither flower, berry nor seed to support the tiniest life. No animal can live on its stringy, indigestible fodder. The rank growth crushes out any possibility of nobler, more generous plant life. The old earth gives a tired sigh, her bosom heaves and sinks and the waters rush in and cover the jungle, drown it, crush it, bury it with silt, compress and mummify it, and it is numbered with the "has-beens," until one day man stumbles upon a fragment of its remains in the face of some sea-cliff, and coal, the food of the steam engine, the motive-power of latter-day commerce and civilization, is discovered. Alive, it was a worthless weed; dead, it becomes "black diamonds."

When we turn to the higher forms of being, the dependence of life upon precedent death is so self-evident as to have been formulated into a truism. That the grass must die that sheep may live and that sheep must die that man may live are facts as familiar as the multiplication table. If the command "Thou shalt not kill" were to be interpreted to extend to our animal cousins and our vegetable ancestors it might as well read at once "Thou shalt starve."

Now let us look for a few moments at the second prevailing misconception of death as a destroyer and waster. This is apparently supported by a vast array of facts, ranging from the tremendous loss of life among the eggs or young of the lower forms to the sudden cutting short of existences in which meet the labor and preparation of generations of the past and the hopes of the future. What is the use of being born only to die, of laboriously building up an organism or character, only to have it destroyed, annihilated, scattered like smoke?

To the first part of the question the answer almost suggests itself, viz., that this destruction is only apparent. Nothing is really lost at all. Merely the form is changed, and as it is necessary that life should be produced in great abundance in order to give Nature, figuratively speaking, a wide field for selection, some method becomes absolutely indispensable by which the

elements of the unfit, incompetent, non-elect forms can be promptly returned to the great crucible of Nature, there to be available for use in new and approved patterns. So far from being a waster, death is the great economist of Nature, enabling her to conduct her most extensive experiments with a mere handful of material.

But, you will reply, this accounts only, so to speak, for the materials used. Are not the vantage ground so hardly won, the wonderful organizing power, the long years expended, utterly lost and hopelessly wasted? I answer, No, but rather secured thereby. They become an immutable part of the history of the race. The upward growth of the race is not an even, continuous line, but a series of ever-ascending, tiny curves, each the life of an individual, and the tiny shoot of the curve of the life that is to follow is given off from near our highest point.

Death is the great embalmer, the casket into which our loved ones are received in the very flower of their beauty and the glory of their strength. A sheaf of corn fully ripe is a beautiful, dignified, inspiring sight and memory, but it must be *reaped* to make it so, and not left on the stem to rot, and freeze.

And it should not be forgotten that so long as life lasts, not only is growth possible, but degeneration also; and that the further the zenith of power is passed, the more probable does the latter become. Nothing can imperil the good that a man has done, save his own later weakness, treason or folly; and when the mortal dart pierces him it transfixes him where he stands, and secures the vantage ground he has won. His function here is, as it were, a ratchet upon the notched wheel of human progress, to secure every inch gained as a starting point for the life to come.

But the crowning beauty and noblest impulse of the process is that it is intrinsically a burying of the old life to render possible and enrich the new. The parent form falls with all the scars, the weariness and grime of the conflict into the gentle lap of Mother Earth, in order that the new life may rise fresh, pure, triumphant. Old errors are buried, old failures forgotten. The race takes a fresh start every generation. We are all but drops in the grand stream of life which flows with ever widening sweep through all the ages.

We are immortal, if we but form a true sturdy link in the great chain of life. It is this unbroken continuity of life, ever rising to nobler levels from the ashes of apparent death, that is so beautifully typified by the Phœnix and similar traditions.

We should cheerfully pay the debt of Nature, proudly confident that she will be able to invest the capital to better advantage next time from the interest we have laboriously added to it. There need be no shrinking dread of the "pangs of dissolution," the "final agony;" for such things have no existence save in disordered imaginations. Ask any physician whose head is silvered o'er with gray, and he will tell you that while disease is often painful, death itself is gentle, painless, natural, like the fading of a flower or the falling of a leaf. It is literally true that "there is a time to die" as well as to live, and when that time comes the event becomes not only tolerable but, like all other natural processes, desirable; every fibre of our tired, worn-out being demands it. When death comes near enough, so that we can see the eyes behind the mask, his face is as welcome as that of his twin brother Sleep.

WOODS HUTCHINSON.

IS LAND HELD OUT OF USE?

THOSE who advocate a single tax on land values as a remedy for that discontent which is assuming such an alarming aspect, argue that land and labor are factors of production, and, that, as much land within the margin of cultivation is not in use, and as many persons who are anxious to labor are unable to secure employment, this proves that land is held out of use. Yet a little reflection will show that this is at the most only presumptive evidence of the condition which they allege, and that it does not preclude the possibility of other factors intervening. In fact, the same argument could be used with equal force to prove that cabs are held out of use, and that many persons suffer and die in consequence. Many sick and weakly persons that now die would be restored to health if they were able to hire a cab and drive into the country, yet the selfish owners of cabs persist in charging prohibitory rates for their use.

When thus confronted single taxers retort that the amount of available land is limited, while cabs and horses may be multiplied *ad libitum*, and that community of interest causes landlords to extort exorbitant rents to corner land.

It may be remarked that they apparently overlook the fact that in order to corner any commodity, a practical monopoly must be secured—there must be a concert of action among all holders, competition being fatal. But there is not a scintilla more evidence to show that land is cornered than there is to show that cabs are cornered.

Driven from this position they fall back on the claim that the present system of taxing improvements is at the root of the matter, and that if the tax was placed on the naked land, improvement would be untrammeled. But this is simply equivalent to an arraignment of any system of taxation of products and may be applied to the license fees for cabs.

The fact is that the owners of land, while holding it at an exchange value based upon a prospective rent, are willing and anxious to rent it at what the Ricardian law dictates, and that is what would be aimed at in a sensible community in which the single tax was in operation, as that would put the land to the best use, and otherwise tenants would obtain an inequitable advantage. That, in order to accomplish this, land situated in and near growing communities may remain unoccupied for considerable periods will appear by the following consideration: Let it be assumed that a dwelling was erected on a lot which then rented at $100, and that the rent having subsequently increased to $500 the building was destroyed by fire. Now a little reflection will show that it might be a foolish venture to rebuild the dwelling.

If, as would probably be the case, there had been an increase in the rent owing to the more remunerative use to which adjoining lots are put, the question would arise whether it might not become impossible to burthen the tenant with the increased rent which might be expected in the near future; in other words, whether a dwelling was the best use to which the lot could be put, the fact being that a store, hotel or club-house would probably be the best. This being case, the owner might wisely decide to wait until such an applicant appeared and then put up an improvement to suit him.

It is difficult to perceive how the appropriation of the rent in taxation would alter the conditions, for prospective tenants would apply the same reasoning if they were wise and the lot would have to await an occupant as

at present. Even if it was offered at a rent of $400, to force it into use, yet sensible men would not erect a dwelling with the chance of being dispossessed by an effective bid of over $500 in a few years which would involve them in a loss.

The same reasoning may be applied to unoccupied land generally, and, while the judgment of landlords is not infallible, yet, in their competitive efforts to obtain the Ricardian rent, they are putting the land to the best use. It may be further remarked that when the land is within the margin for improvements the ultimate purchaser is an improver, and therefore the offer of land for sale is an effective effort to improve, the price being very generally enhanced by a prospective increase in rent; but there is no evidence whatever that free competition is less operative in determining the exchange value of land than that of shoes or other commodities.

While it is true that large gains are often realized in the exchange of land, it is also true that the other side of the account shows heavy losses, but the single taxers close their eyes to these as firmly as those who regard the cornering of wheat as a gigantic wrong close them to the sacrifices of the manipulators. It should be noted that nothing which has been said above denies the iniquity of the private appropriation of the rent. A careful study of the subject by the writer leads him to believe that the measure for removing the inequity of our social organization is to be found in quite a different direction.

WILLIAM B. COOPER.

SING-PO'S CHART.

THE Mandarin Sing-Po was equally renowned for his learning and beloved for his amiability. Besought by a great number of his humble neighbors to reveal to them the wonders of the world beyond the Foo-Noo-Shan, he ascended the loftiest peak of that majestic range, and there drew his famous Chart of the World. Within the limits of sight his chart was true, barring certain unimportant errors in proportion, due to his inability to reduce perspective to ground plan. For the rest, he drew from memory and hearsay, but chiefly from his prolific imagination. Around the circle of the known swept a great ocean, like that which zoned the shield of Achilles. In the remotest border of the blue tide were posted at regular intervals, like watchmen on Hwangtee's great wall, an array of little islands bearing the names England, France, Germany, Russia, America, etc.

The public exhibition of Sing-Po's chart vastly increased both his fame and his popularity, until at last a series of foreign wars brought with them the increased knowledge of the outer world, which has always been war's chief recompense for its cruel ravages, from the time of Abraham down to Lord Clyde.

> Then turned around the vulgar throng
> To seek for the fool who had told them wrong
> And fearful vengeance upon his head
> They would have wreaked—but he had fled—
> As other sages may some day flee,
> Where'er they be, who think they see
> The whole of heaven, and earth, and man
> In the little span that they can scan
> From a mountain peak of their Foo-Noo-Shan.

Did Sing-Po flee to America? Whether he did or not, his counterpart is

here in many capacities. He preaches from the pulpit, he rants from the platform, he thunders in the editorial, he lectures in the professor's chair. On the stage of Boston Music Hall, a while ago, stood a man whose name is known on both sides of the Atlantic, whose unconsidered invectives and oracular discourses are sought by great syndicates and devoured by millions of eager readers. His subject was Evolution. He held up to scorn the great modern system of thought which has done more to emancipate the human mind from primordial ignorance and superstition than any other one agency. He kicked it about the stage as if it were a football. He poured upon it floods of abusive ridicule.

The rushing torrent of his eloquence was unobstructed by any but the most superficial knowledge of facts. Any youth who had studied the subject for one term at school must have wondered at the crass ignorance that was unblushingly poured forth into the ears of that great audience. The more puerile the arguments, the more sonorous the periods in which they were uttered and the more absurdly extravagant the gestures with which they were emphasized. The more intelligent of his hearers must have been reminded of the philosophy with which the doctrine of the earth's sphericity was first antagonized. "If the earth be round," urged the Sing-Pos of that day, "trees must grow downward on the other side; men must stand with their feet uppermost; and pray, what is to prevent the water from pouring downward into space?"

And yet that great Boston audience applauded! Whether in good faith or in derision, I cannot tell.

The number of those whose lifework is teaching is very large. Clergymen, journalists, statesmen, artists, authors, are all teachers, and upon all alike rests the same great responsibility—to teach only that which is *true*. Next to the ignoble desire for notoriety, perhaps the greatest obstacle to the faithful discharge of this responsibility is the vast amount of material that is demanded from teachers of all classes. Think of the four to twenty or more big closely-printed pages of the daily paper, the thick monthly magazine, the thousands of volumes yearly issued from the press, the weekly discourses from the pulpit, the five or six hours a day in the schoolroom, and judge whether, on the whole, Error does not have a better chance for a hearing than Truth.

EDWARD P. JACKSON.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXXIX.

JUNE, 1893.

THE LESSON OF THE NAVAL REVIEW.

BY THE HON. HILARY A. HERBERT, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

THE grand stand upon which President Cleveland stood when he opened the Columbian Exposition at Chicago fronts towards the great lake which is there fringed by a façade crowned with statuary. Behind the President, and to the right and the left of him, stood buildings which in their splendor and beauty seemed the work of some great magician. Looking upon these and then upon the sea of happy and expectant faces that greeted him, Mr. Cleveland said :

"We have built these splendid edifices, but we have also built the magnificent fabric of a popular government, whose grand proportions are seen throughout the world. We have made and here gather together objects of use and beauty, the products of American skill and invention; but we have also made men who rule themselves. It is an exalted mission in which we and our guests from other lands are engaged, as we coöperate in the inauguration of an enterprise devoted to human enlightenment, and in the undertaking we here enter upon we exemplify in the noblest sense the brotherhood of nations."

There is not a phase of the naval display which, at the water's edge of our country, formed so fitting a prelude to the opening ceremonies of the great exposition that does not inspire such thoughts. Certainly no scene was more beautiful, and none more suggestive than that which greeted the eyes of those on board the "Dolphin" as she steamed into Hampton Roads on the morning of

Copyright, 1893, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

the 22d of April. The air was soft, and the sun shone brightly, as the little ship ploughed her way into these historic waters. Within this generation there was fought here the famous battle between the "Merrimac" and the "Monitor." It was that battle which had put the work-shops of the world to work at ships and guns of new device, creating a revolution in naval architecture, the latest results of which were the splendid men-of-war that now lay so peacefully side by side in the famous roadstead.

The "Merrimac," the Confederacy, and the great civil war had passed into history, the Union of the States had been preserved and strengthened, the sting of defeat and the shouts of victory had been forgotten, and now those who had ranged themselves on the side of the Confederacy were vying with those who had fought for the Union in doing honor to the flag that floated over the "Dolphin." A few miles further on, at the Norfolk Navy Yard, lay the U. S. S. "Constellation," successor to the old ship that, in 1799, had fought to death the French ship "L'Insurgente." Now there lay here four beautiful men-of-war floating the tri-color and joining in honors to the American flag.

In 1807 there had sailed out of this roadstead for the Mediterranean the U. S. S. "Chesapeake." When only a few miles beyond the capes she was overtaken by the British ship "Leopard." A demand was made for three men claimed as deserters from a British vessel, and, upon a refusal by the American, the English ship opened a furious fire upon the "Chesapeake," which, being unprepared for the attack, was compelled to surrender. This outrageous act of the British officer, though at first disavowed by his government, was a prime cause in rousing that feeling of indignation which, eventually, in 1812, compelled the President of the United States to declare war against Great Britain. In singular contrast with the conduct of the commander of the "Leopard," here now, in these waters where that ship had watched for the departure of the "Chesapeake," the commander of the British fleet, Sir John Hopkins, was distinguishing himself by the urbanity and zeal with which he labored for the success of the great International Review.

Here, in this beautiful sheet of water, lay at anchor men-of-war representing nine nations, six of them, Great Britain, Spain, Italy, Russia, the Netherlands and Germany, monarchical in form. As the "Dolphin" hove in sight there was not a cloud in the sky, and each

of the thirty war-ships in view seemed hung with rainbows of many colors. They were all dressed in the gay colors of Italy in honor of the twenty-fifth anniversary of King Humbert's marriage. Amid the thousands of American citizens who lined those shores and manned ships in that harbor there was not one who was not intensely devoted to republican government, yet it is probably true that there was not one among them all who criticised the bestowal of these honors upon a king. All felt that this gathering typified what was well called by Mr. Cleveland the "brotherhood of nations." To our officers and sailors these honors were not, perhaps, as striking, because they were not as novel, as to the civilians who had never witnessed such a scene. There is a code of honor and of courtesy prevailing among naval officers of all flags that is the happy growth of centuries. It is civilizing, refining, and has a constant tendency, when properly observed, to promote peace and good-will among the nations of the earth. This code the American naval officer is happily fitted to practise by the training he receives at Annapolis. A nation's navy is the right arm of its diplomacy. There is a constant call upon the naval officer to practise the amenities of life in intercourse with men of other nations. He is often obliged, by the duties of his position, to receive and to entertain, not only naval officers, but often distinguished civilians. The British Government furnishes certain of its fleet commanders an entertainment fund. One who is familiar with the exigencies which make such frequent demands upon our fleet commanders, cannot but regret that the United States has not some similar provision of law. Such an appropriation, however, should always be carefully restricted.

The dinners given on board the American ships at the Rendezvous and the Review were paid for by the Government. Congress appropriated funds for them, because the foreign ships were the invited guests of the nation, and our officers could not afford, from their own private means, to entertain on so large a scale.

The boat races, and friendly musical contests, that formed such a pleasant feature of the gathering at Hampton Roads, were also not entirely without precedent. Neither was there anything especially uncommon in the number of ships that were assembled. In numbers the combined fleets did not compare with the Spanish Armada, nor with the vessels that fought at Trafalgar,

nor even with the French fleet of more than one hundred modern vessels that assembled for practise off Cherbourg and Brest in 1891, nor with the great British fleets that have more than once in later years manœuvred off the coast of England. Nor is this the first occasion upon which the ships of different nations have assembled to celebrate a great event. Sixty ships of war, all told, belonging to several nations, assembled at Barcelona at the opening of the exposition in 1888, sixteen of these being battle-ships; and at the Columbus celebration in Genoa, in September last, there were thirty-nine men-of-war, including thirteen battle-ships. But at Barcelona and Genoa there was no concert of action, no common programme, no commander whose directions or requests were followed. Each squadron was there to lend its presence and that was all.

The combined fleets of nine nations, the Brazilians having come in and the Spaniards having left with their caravels for New York on Sunday, set sail from Hampton Roads on Monday, the 24th of April, at about 10 o'clock. The "Dolphin" did not take a place in the line but steamed alongside for a time, and at 12 o'clock fell back half way down the line, signalled to the fleet "good-by and a pleasant voyage," and then steamed on ahead. When half a mile in advance Captain Buckingham, for a better view of the fleet, turned the head of the little vessel gradually across the lines made by the advancing columns, and then was witnessed from her decks a scene that has no parallel in history. There were two lines of vessels, almost perfect, the starboard column headed by the English ship "Blake," followed by the ships of seven other foreign countries; the port column headed by the "Philadelphia" and composed of thirteen American vessels. All were steaming at the prescribed rate, under command, by courtesy, of the American Rear-Admiral Gherardi. No question of rank or precedence and no desire to be independent marred the programme. It was an illustration of "brotherhood of nations." So of the Review in New York harbor on the 27th. Each ship took its prescribed place, manned its yards and saluted the President as he passed by.

A little over seventy years ago, so hostile was the feeling on the Continent of Europe to republican government that Russia, Prussia and Austria entered jointly into a project, which happily proved futile, to aid Spain in reasserting her dominion over cer-

tain of her revolted colonies in America, solely because they had established over themselves governments republican in form. How suggestive it was that Russia and Germany (comprising Prussia) had now sent their ships to these waters to join with the ships of republican France, and of South American republics (all to act under the command of an American Admiral), in doing honor to him who had discovered the continent which is now the home of republics. Especially noticeable and memorable now was the blue cross of Russia. Russia is the most absolute of monarchies, yet no flag was more welcome than hers. America will never forget that, in the trying time when the United States seemed about to be rent in twain by civil war, the great Muscovite Empire was the steadfast friend of the Union.

But the crowning, and, in many respects, the most interesting feature of the whole was the land parade of the sailors on the 28th of April in the streets of New York. When the proposition to have such a parade was first mentioned the naval officers consulted received it with, to say the least, doubts and misgivings. Our naval officers are, fortunately, conservative; they have been trained to stand *supra antiquas vias*, and they feared that there would be failure in an attempt to get so many foreign troops to land, with arms in their hands, on American soil. No such thing had ever been tried or thought of. But when it was decided upon, the officers who had doubted made it a success. And the shore parade, while it was the most significant act of good will to the American people and American institutions, was also the crowning lesson of the Review. The crowds who looked on, no doubt, concurred with patriotic unanimity in the idea that the Yankee sailor was entitled to the prize, but every thoughtful observer was impressed with the idea that if our men should ever come to blows with their friends who were behind them in line, they could never hope to win except with a fair supply of ships and guns. The stalwart Russians, with their sturdy tramp; the business-looking Britons, keeping step to "God Save the Queen;" the quick-stepping Frenchmen; the Germans, with their natty uniforms; the Italians, and, indeed, all the detachments of the unique body of men were drilled and disciplined into fighting machines. Never was such a sight witnessed before as the sailors of nine different nations marching together, and never was anything better calculated to impress upon those who saw

them the lesson that the American sailor can keep his place upon the seas only when his Government is behind him.

The most pleasing and singular feature of this parade was to see Russians and Englishmen, who have for years been watching each other with jealous eyes over the mountain ranges that divide their Eastern possessions, marching one after another, and Germans and Frenchmen, who are sworn enemies at home, following each other with friendly footsteps on American soil. Italy and Germany are said to be in league with Austria against Russia and France, and here, in the streets of New York, Italy, France, Germany and Russia were all in friendly competition for the favor of bystanders. How naturally comes the thought that the United States, which is now leading all the civilized world in the direction of free institutions, is to lead in that path that shall bring the people of the earth to universal peace. In that direction our past history points us. England, though our mother country, was long our bitterest foe. For years after the Revolution she refused to make a treaty consummating the results of the War of Independence, and she was still smarting under the loss of her colonies when her persistent assaults on our rights goaded us into the War of 1812. Great Britain never formally renounced the right of search, on account of the claim of which the War of 1812 was fought, until 1858. But the two countries have made peace at last. Mutual good will and respect have been testified in many ways, and never more significantly than at the naval review. In the waters of New York, the same in which so many thousands of American prisoners died in British prison ships during the Revolution, Sir John Hopkins, the British Admiral, flashed out on the night of the 27th of April, 1893, the figure of George Washington, a more striking act of amity even than the reverential visit paid some years ago by Lord Coleridge, the Chief Justice of England, to the tomb at Mount Vernon. The most substantial proof that there is to be enduring peace between us is furnished by the arbitration between the two countries of the Alabama claims in 1872, of the Fisheries question at a later date, and of the Fur Seal question now being discussed at Paris. Arbitration has become the mode of settling disputes between Great Britain and the United States. It is fondly hoped that we will adhere to this method, and that in the near future the examples set by the two leading countries of the world may be followed by other nations.

When it shall become common among nations to substitute international tribunals for the arbitrament of the sword, the philanthropist may look forward with hope for the coming of the time bodied forth in that dream of the poet—

> "When the war-drum throbbed no longer and the battle-flags were furled
> In the Parliament of Man—the Federation of the world."

That happy time, however, is yet in the far distant future. Dreamers have been for years predicting its speedy coming, but the world's bloody record of battles in this nineteenth century warns all practical men that its realization can be anticipated only from the refining influences of generations yet to be. It is undoubtedly the mission of our Government to lead in that direction. The Geneva arbitration was the first step. That was followed by the commissions to arbitrate the fisheries and fur seal questions, and now by the international review which has presented the remarkable spectacle of the sailors of many nations, armed to the teeth against each other at home, coming together upon American soil to celebrate in a manner never before witnessed the victories of peace achieved by the freest people in the world. Our country, in this great onward march of the world, is in the lead. She must keep her place, and to do so her people must remember that the Geneva arbitration was achieved only after the terrific battles of our civil war had demonstrated to the world the fighting capacity of our citizen soldiery, when the fortunate termination of that war had left us one great people, and when the American navy, suddenly improvised upon new lines to meet the exigencies of that war, though crude and clumsy in many respects, was believed to be the most powerful in the world. The real Quaker who will submit to insult rather than resent it by violence is not a successful peacemaker among men. Neither can a nation which adopts a Quaker policy, however great it may be in natural resources, expect in this age of the world that its international disputes shall be arbitrated by international tribunals, or hope to keep the lead in the great work of bringing about the "brotherhood of nations." If America would keep her own peace with all the nations of the earth and maintain her place in the vanguard of civilization she must be at all times prepared for war. This is the lesson of history emphasized by the Rendezvous and the Review.

HILARY A. HERBERT.

WHO ARE THE CHIEF WEALTH-PRODUCERS?

BY W. H. MALLOCK, AUTHOR OF "THE NEW REPUBLIC," "IS LIFE WORTH LIVING?" "A ROMANCE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY," ETC.

THE economic theory which forms for millions the basis of the views and feelings which they hold and cherish with regard to social problems, is that all wealth is produced by those kinds of toil or exertion of which all healthy men are capable, and to which the great majority of men, in every community, must and do devote themselves, and that consequently all private fortunes, or the exceptional riches of a minority, are simply an abstraction from the social product of the majority. Some of those who hold this theory look on this abstraction as mere legalized fraud or robbery. Others consider that for some reason, never sufficiently explained, the rich man has somehow a right to possess his riches, though he generally deserves to be denounced for the manner in which he uses them. But at all events they, all of them, consider that the wealth of which great private fortunes are composed cannot possibly have been produced by the men who, fairly or unfairly, acquire it; and that a great fortune enjoyed by one man means necessarily the possession by one man of things that have been produced by many men.

This theory is at the bottom of nearly all the social agitation of to-day, creating confusion and misunderstanding amongst men who ought to understand each other, rendering futile and mischievous much practical effort, and turning much generous and genuine feeling into absurdity. For, although when looked at superficially, it has the air of a truism, it embodies in reality the gravest of all speculative errors which, in our day, have affected any practical problem; and it is high time that the exponents of economic science should rouse themselves, should expose its true character in clear and precise language, and should once for all expel it from the popular mind by establishing in its place the antagonistic truth that corresponds to it. For the political economists are mainly to blame for its prevalence; and though it

may not be correct to say that they themselves are guilty of it, it could never have spread itself as it has done if it had not been for the inaccuracy and incompleteness both of their thought and their terminology with regard to a certain fundamental part of their subject. My aim, in the present paper, is to point out exactly what this inaccuracy and this incompleteness are; but first let me state briefly what the truth is, by which the error I have just indicated requires to be displaced.

If the error has at first sight the air of a truism, the truth at first sight will have the air of a paradox; for it is this—that instead of the riches of the few being taken from the products of the many, the present competence of the many is taken from the products of the few; and that not only do the few as a body produce the whole of the wealth which they enjoy, but that they produce as a body every increase of wealth which is year by year enjoyed by the many also. Great fortunes of certain kinds—such as those of stockbrokers—*are* no doubt abstractions; they represent the *capture* of wealth, not the actual *creation* of it; but the wealth that in such cases is captured is principally, if not entirely, wealth produced by the few, and captured from the few; and even were this not so, it could make no difference to the main fact I am asserting. For before wealth can be captured, it must have been produced by some one; and what I assert is that in all modern countries—in such at least as have been enriched by modern industrial progress—a minority produces more wealth than the majority; that it produces the entire wealth of the richer classes, and a part, that is yearly larger, of the wealth of the poorer classes; and that so far are the few from being the plunderers of the many, that the many, economically speaking, are the mere pensioners of the few. I said that at first sight such a statement has the air of a paradox; but it will appear in a different light when its real meaning is considered.

In the United States the same number of men who in the year 1840 produced wealth to the value of a thousand million dollars a year produce at the present day wealth to the value of two thousand three hundred millions. That is to say, in proportion to the number of producers, the product in fifty years has increased fifty-three per cent., whilst if we carry back our inquiries to the beginning of the present century we shall find that it has increased by at least sixty-six per cent. Now this increase in the

productivity of the producers must be due to some cause or causes which are in operation now, and were not in operation then. In other words, for every hundred million dollars produced in the United States in the year 1893 sixty-six millions are due to causes which were not in operation in the year 1800; and as to what these causes are, there can, of course, be no doubt. They are scientific invention and discovery, and improved methods of dividing and applying labor. But these improvements have not been the work of chance, or of nature. They have been brought about by the deliberate and persistent action of men, and the millions which we just now said to be due to the improvements have been really due to the men by whom the improvements were made.

Let me pause for a moment to insist on this last point. When it happens—as happens in all modern production—that single products are produced by the action of great numbers of men, we cannot say, as we could under simpler conditions of industry, that in a literal sense any one man produced any one thing. Accordingly, unless we maintain that the products are produced by nobody, we are obliged to say that each man produces so much of the product as is added to the total when he joins in the process of production, or so much as would disappear from the total if he withdrew from the process of production. Thus, if we found that at any given period a thousand men produced cloth to the value of two thousand dollars a day, and another man arrived on the scene, who by controlling and directing them, enabled a thousand and one men to produce cloth to the value of six thousand dollars a day, we would say that this thousand-and-first man produced every day cloth to the value of four thousand dollars. This thousand-and-first man may be taken to represent all those men by whose action industrial productivity has increased during the present century; and they, like that one man, must be held to be the actual producers of whatever additional wealth is, through their action, produced by the same number of men. These men who, as will appear presently, are a very small minority, correspond, broadly speaking, with the wealthier classes; and out of every hundred million dollars produced in the United States to-day, these men produce at least sixty-six millions.

When the truth on which I am insisting is explained in this

way, the paradoxical aspect which it at first wears disappears. In the eyes even of those who are most inclined to dispute it, it ceases to be an absurdity which they can ignore; it appears in the light of a fallacy which it is necessary to refute; and the sole ground on which it can be attacked becomes at once apparent. That ground is as follows: It may be urged—and indeed it constantly is urged—that all kinds of industrial action are to be classed together, as alike depending on social conditions in which we all share. No invention, no discovery, it is said, however new and important, is the work of any one man. The man who nominally makes it has used the inventions and the discoveries of others; and he could never have made it if those others had not gone before him, and if society in general had not coöperated with them in bringing their ideas to a practical issue. Hence, it is argued that, however great may have been the effect of the action of a few men, their power of acting was derived entirely from society, and that society has a right to whatever wealth may result from it; in fact, that society as a whole has virtually produced the wealth—that the wealth is a social product.

I shall show presently that to argue in this way is about as accurate and scientific as it would be to say of an anthem which Handel had just composed, and was himself playing on an organ, that it was the social product of the musician and the man who blew the bellows; or to say of a portrait by Sir Joshua Reynolds, that it was the social product of the painter and the man who prepared the canvas. But though the argument is really absurd, it is to a certain extent plausible; and it can be properly refuted only by examining it with some care. And this brings me back to what I said about the political economists: for here is the point with regard to which I taxed them with inaccuracy and incompleteness; and it is to these deficiencies on their part, both in analysis and language, that the plausibility of the above argument is due.

In the accepted language of political economy all industrial action is classed under the head of labor, and if any economist is asked by what kind of action these improvements were brought about which have made labor more productive he will answer by labor of certain special kinds—by the labor of invention, the labor of scientific discovery, or the labor of superintendence. These are the phrases employed by J. S. Mill, and though later writers have

attacked and amended many of his doctrines they have all of them to this day adhered rigidly to his analysis and terminology, by regarding and treating all kinds of industrial exertion as so many manifestations of the same force which is exerted when a man ploughs a field, carries a sack, builds a wall, or employs a tool at a turning lathe. They are one and all classed under the common heading of labor, and the higher kinds, which are particularized by the term *ability*, are regarded as nothing but labor that is highly skilled.

Now if this were merely a question of scientific terms, such an inclusive use of the term *labor* might be possibly quite admissible, and might in itself lead to no misapprehensions. Political economy, however, is a science that can be of no value, except in so far as its teachings are apprehended by practical men generally; and it happens that the term *labor*, as used by practical men, has a widely different meaning from that which the economists give to it. The economists use it so as to include ability. Practical men use it so as to specifically exclude ability. There can be about this no manner of doubt. Let us, for instance, take the case of the sewing-machine. The production of every sewing-machine in existence must, if we use the language of the economists, be said to be largely due to the labor of the principal inventor, namely, the late Mr. Singer, who, by this so-called labor, produced for himself one of the largest fortunes in America; but no politician who in any industrial dispute were to give himself out as representing the claims of labor would be understood, in any quarter of the civilized world, as professing to represent the claims of such persons as Mr. Singer. As soon as the ability of such persons succeeds and enriches them with its proper fruit—that is to say, as soon as its true character shows itself—it is at once excluded in the thought of the world generally from the kinds of exertion which the world generally means by labor. And the world in general is perfectly right. If the term *labor* is used in the sense which, for all practical purposes, is universally attached to it, labor and ability *are* two distinct things. But here comes in the mischief produced by the error of the economists. Since the economists persist in speaking and conceiving of labor as including all kinds of industrial exertion, and since what the world means by labor does not include ability, it has come about that, in the thought of the world generally, ability is not regarded as

any kind of industrial exertion, or as forming any factor in the production of the "social product."

The error to which more immediately this misconception is due is an error in economic language; but the real source of it is an error in economic analysis—an overlooking of the real difference between the faculties exercised by the inventor, the discoverer, the director, on the one hand, and the mechanic, the ploughman, or "the toiler," on the other. The difference is not one of greater or less skill. The invention of a new machine does not represent a development of the faculties employed in giving a perfect finish to its parts. Nor does the difference consist, except in an accidental way, in the fact that one kind of exertion is mainly mental, and the other muscular; for there are many kinds of exertion recognized by everybody as labor (such for instance as that of a pointsman on a railway) in which the mind is the principal thing employed. The real difference is this: *Labor is the industrial exertion of a single man on some single piece of work, and on that single piece of work only,* no matter what this may be—the carrying of a sack or the wheeling of a barrow, which requires no training at all; or the finishing of a chronometer, which requires the training of half a life-time. *Ability is the industrial exertion of a single man, which affects simultaneously the labor of many men,* multiplying or improving the results of it in each case.

This is the fundamental distinction—entirely neglected by the economists—between the two great forces which, in the modern world, produce wealth; and nearly all the confusion which prevails to-day with regard to economic questions is due to the fact that this distinction has been overlooked, and that the two forces have been treated as varieties of one. Unless this distinction, and the exact nature of it, are recognized, and these two forces are separated in thought and name, it is as impossible without confusion or self-contradiction to either explain the phenomenon of modern industrial progress as a whole, or to discuss the problems to which it has given rise, as it would be to discuss or explain the theories of modern chemistry on the assumption that the universe was composed of the traditional four elements. But the moment we recognize that there are involved not one force but two, and that they differ from one another in the way above described, what before was impossible becomes simple and easy. We can at

once see and understand the force which represents the element of change in industrial productivity, and to which all the increase of wealth in the modern world has been due; which is at the present day producing the greater part of it; and which, being the natural monopoly of a small class, explains how the minority are creators not of their own wealth only, but of a large portion of the wealth of the majority besides.

To establish this point fully, as against hostile criticism, would require a book—and I hope to devote one to this subject—instead of a short article; for industrial ability is of various kinds, and unless these are all fully considered the nature of their operations cannot be made clear, nor the extent to which, and the exact sense in which, each is a natural monopoly. But enough can be said, even in the course of a few pages, to indicate the principal facts which such an examination would bring home to us.

In the first place, then, it will become evident to us that industrial ability—or the faculty by which one man assists the labor of an indefinite number of men—may be either the genius of the scientific discoverer, the ingenuity of the inventor, the critical shrewdness of the man who discriminates a useful invention from useless ones and supplies or procures capital for putting it into use; or it may be the enterprise or tenacity of purpose that pushes a business and overcomes difficulties; or the gift of managing men by which labor is economized; or it may be the gift of constructive imagination by which labor is directed to the accomplishment of new ends. This is a rough classification, but it is sufficient for our present purpose, and it will enable the reader to realize the following truth—that all the various kinds of ability indicated are fundamentally gifts of character, not the results of education. Let a hundred men from childhood be brought up in the same school, let them all be devoted to the same branch of knowledge, let them enjoy to the fullest what is called "equality of opportunity," and it will be found that not only is there no equality in the amount of knowledge they acquire, but that there is hardly any resemblance in the practical uses to which they will be able to put it. Two men may have worked together in one laboratory. One will never do more than understand the discoveries of others. The other will discover, like Columbus, some new world of mysteries. And as in discovery, so in action—so in the management of men—education does noth-

ing to equalize differences of men's powers. Rather it tends to show them, whilst, as for invention, some of the greatest inventors of the world have been men who can hardly be said to have had any education at all. Arkwright, for instance, had not even the education that might have come from being apprenticed to the industry which his genius revolutionized.

And here let us us notice how skill is something entirely different. Skill is entirely an acquisition—the result of training or education ; and is often a social, rather than an individual product —as may be seen if we look back to the earlier conditions of industry, when each craft was a "mystery," and when, in the case of trades localized in the same place for generations, each worker was familiarized from childhood with methods, and tricks of dexterity, not known elsewhere. The hardware industries in certain English towns afford remarkable examples of this. Mere skill in such industries was perhaps greater at the beginning of the present century than it is now. And yet such are the limits of skill that the development of the steam engine was for a long time retarded by the difficulty experienced in making the cylinders of engines with anything like sufficient accuracy ; and if the world had had to depend upon skill alone the steam engine as we now know it would be still an utter impossibility. What made it possible was the ability of a small number of men, among whom may be mentioned Maudslay—the inventor or introducer of the slide-rest. These men, by the improvements they introduced in the machinery by which machines are made suddenly endowed thousands of skilled laborers with a power of accurate workmanship which was never before attainable. This power descended on them from the inventors like the fires of an industrial pentecost, and their efficiency, which was the slowly-matured social product of centuries, was by a force acting outside themselves multiplied a hundred fold within a few years.

Now when once an invention, such as that of Maudslay, is made, it becomes, unless it is patented, public property, and this fact introduces us to another set of considerations. We shall find if we analyze the results of ability, that they divide themselves into three classes : first, those which the author can keep to himself by means of a patent or otherwise, but which if not protected can be made use of by other people ; secondly, those which are not susceptible of being patented or otherwise monopolized, but

which as soon as they are achieved necessarily become common property, such as the discovery of some new natural principle, or some exceedingly simple process; and, lastly, those which not only cannot be protected, but do not require protection, because they can never become common property, or be separated from the able man, such as the results on a business of an able man's management or enterprise. It is only when we deal with the second of these classes of results that we find any plausibility remaining in the socialistic argument which merges the functions of ability in those of social labor. A savant who discovers some new natural principle, and publishes the fact in a scientific treatise, can hardly claim to be the producer of any portion of the products which result from the application of this principle to industry. But the reason is that a discoverer of this kind rarely sees or cares to see farther than the natural principle itself, leaving it to others to make a practical application of it; * and the moment we come to consider the practical applications of a discovery we shall find that these are the monopoly of ability of other kinds—the ability that invents new machines, new apparatus, new appliances, new commodities and the ability that manages men. There can, it is true, be no monopoly of knowledge; but the wider and more complex knowledge becomes, the more marked is the monopoly of the powers that enable men to command and use it. The two kinds of ability then that directly affect industry we may call, for the sake of brevity, *inventive ability* and the *ability of enterprise*; and it will be seen that neither of these can, in any practical sense, be regarded as merged in the common social exertion of the community, but that they are both of them the natural monopoly of a small and distinct class. The electric light, for instance, or the telephone, are no more the social products of the present age than "Hamlet" was the social product of the whole population of England at the time of Elizabeth; and a community can no more be said to be the author of what the man of ability invents than it can be said to enjoy the income which the man of ability spends.

All these points require to be carefully worked out; but their

* The effect, for instance, of Maudslay's slide rest was the same on all mechanical labor of a certain kind. Every workman of a certain grade received equal help from it; whilst a new natural principle may be known by everybody; but no workman will be assisted by it in any way till it is seized on and utilized by some one able man, or a few able men.

general bearings can be perceived from even this brief mention of them. It will be perceived how distinct ability is from labor, at once in the nature of its operation and in the class of persons possessing it; how the ability of one man is, in productive power, out of all proportion to the labor of one man; and how it may, without any greater effort being involved, produce results which are a thousand times as great.

Perhaps the best means by which, in a short space, I can elucidate the subject will be by calling the attention of the reader to a beautiful and interesting illustration, which will throw a yet further light on the various kinds of ability involved in the production of commodities, and the relation they bear to labor, and to each other. The illustration I refer to is that afforded by the business of the publisher. A publisher may publish books which will either be bought by nobody, or by very few people, or by many people, and not only the value of his business to himself, but the extent to which it enriches the community, will depend on how many people wish for the books, and on how much they wish for them. If it cost a thousand dollars to produce an edition of a book, and no one would buy a copy, all the exertion involved in producing it would be wasted. The edition would have no exchange value. If only five people wanted to buy copies the exchange value of the whole edition would be only the exchange value of those five copies; whilst if on the other hand the edition had been limited to five copies only, and these had been priced at two hundred dollars each, it might well happen that even this small demand would be destroyed. There are certainly not many books, which if one copy only were wanted, it would be worth while to print; for few customers would pay for the cost of producing them. In order to make a publishing business possible, the exchange value of the books must at all events equal the cost of producing them; and as they will possess no exchange value at all unless they can be sold at a sufficiently moderate price, and as the price will not cover the cost unless there is a demand for a sufficient number of them, it is easy to see the faculties on which the economic production of books depends. It depends—as do all kinds of production—on labor in the first place, much of it being skilled labor; for without this, type could not be made or set, nor could the paper or the binding be produced. But the best paper and the most charming type will not sell

many copies of a book that nobody cares to read; and the very foundation of every publisher's business is the ability which selects such books as at any given moment will be appreciated by the public—that is to say, will possess a sufficient exchange value. It depends entirely on the exertion by him of this ability whether the contents of his warehouse are worth thousands of dollars, or are merely so much waste paper. So far as the amount and quality of the labor is concerned which is employed in their production, they might be either the one thing or the other.*

It remains, however, to take account of the ability of the author, without which the ability of the publisher would be useless. It is not necessary to comment on so obvious a fact as that the value of the labor of the compositor depends on what the author has written; but attention may be called to the connection between the two kinds of ability—that of the author, and that of the publisher, and to their different character. The ability of the author is the ability of invention, and its results must be classed with those which, if not artificially protected, cease, when once they are produced, to be the monopoly of the producer; for any book as soon as the copyright expires becomes the property of any or every publisher who chooses to appropriate it. But the ability of the publisher, which consists in the power of selection and judgment, produces results which remain of necessity his own; for they consist of the salable qualities—or, in other words, the exchange value—of the editions which he offers to the public. The way in which these two kinds of ability coöperate in giving these editions their value—that is to say, in turning a book into a commodity which economically has any value at all—may be left to the consideration of the reader. I will only point out in the briefest way possible how the production of a book, as an economic commodity, illustrates the parts played by ability in all modern products.

It involves, as we have seen, both the ability of invention and the ability of enterprise; and it shows how the results of the ability of the inventor—that is to say, the author—even were they secured to him by the artificial monopoly of copyright

*It is impossible to even mention here all the economic points which the above example illustrates with a singular clearness. But special attention may be called to the luminous way in which the case of a printed book shows the difference between cost of production and value—labor determining one, and ability of the various kinds the other. Labor would produce no value at all, except as the servant of ability.

must, before they can be invested with economic value, be for the time being monopolized by the selective ability of the publisher. It will show also the fallacy of the idea that, because certain results of ability can be monopolized by their authors, only through artificial means, they properly belong to the community; and that men of business ability who utilize these results rob the community of the wealth which this use of them produces. If such men rob anybody, it is not the community that they rob, but some few individuals whose ability is of another kind. For if the publisher of a popular novel should increase his own receipts by paying nothing, or an insufficient sum, to the author, it is plain that the author is robbed of what is due to him, not the reader.

And this suggests the mention of yet another point, which can be here indicated in the most cursory way only. In the popular language of the day, when the men who represent ability are spoken of they are spoken of generally as representing capital. A little reflection will show anybody that capital assists production only in so far as it represents ability and is utilized by ability; that it is, in fact, to ability what hands are to labor. It will be seen also that capital—or at least the larger part of it—is the creation of past ability, not the creation of labor; and that thus, if interest on capital—*which is the sum paid by ability for the use of capital to the owners of capital*—be, as it is often called, robbery, it is a robbery committed not by ability on labor, but by the inheritors of the results of past ability on the monopolists of present ability. It is, in fact, a question between author and publisher, not a question between publisher and public.

There is yet another point which the production of books may suggest to us. It is this—that in maintaining that labor plays a subordinate part in production, we are in no way casting a slur on the general qualities of the laborer. The author of the noblest poem, or the most profound philosophic treatise, may contribute less to the exchangeable wealth of a country during a given year than the author of such a book as *The Mystery of a Hansom Cab*. And thus many a laborer may be far superior as a man to the man on whose industrial ability he is absolutely dependent as a laborer. In dealing with the production of wealth we have simply got to consider what qualities, as a fact, play most part in the production of material values, without any eye to the question

of whether such qualities do not often belong to men who, in point both of disposition and culture, are very inferior persons.

It can in the long run be to the interest of nobody to disguise the truth; and an accurate study of economics will teach us this, that the few, however inferior morally, produce the larger part of the wealth of the modern world; that wealth is not, as is commonly said, the result of social labor but the result of social labor multiplied by ability; and that whatever claims the public may have on the wealth of the minority, that claim cannot be sustained on the ground that the public has produced this wealth; for the minority as a body have not only produced the whole of it, but a vast amount besides, which the public has already appropriated.

W. H. MALLOCK.

HOW TO CHECK TESTAMENTARY LITIGATION.

BY THE HON. RASTUS S. RANSOM, SURROGATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY.

IT WILL be admitted, I think, by all that this subject is of great interest to every citizen, as all must sooner or later leave their earthly possessions to be distributed by their government under the supervision and direction of its chosen officers. All persons will agree that a procedure should exist duly authorized by the statutes of the government, according to which the property of deceased persons shall be collected and distributed in a prompt and economical manner. It is not generally known that the right of inheritance, and the right to dispose of one's property by will, is not a right incident to one's labor and thrift in acquiring such property. According to the principle underlying the modern state the citizen has not ownership in a single dollar of the fruit of his labor, except as such ownership is granted to him by his government. However, under all forms of government in the civilized world, at least, the citizen is permitted to own and control the fruits of his labor and the profits of his business ventures, subject always to the superior title thereto of his government. Here we have briefly stated the reason for the custody by the government of all the property of the citizen after his demise, to be by it appropriated to the payment of any dues to it, such as taxes, to the suitable burial and other funeral expenses of the decedent, to the payment of all his just debts, and of the distribution of the remainder among his heirs if he died without a will, or to those persons who are named by him in his last will as devisees or legatees. The interests or rights of these persons are necessarily controlled by the government, who through its proper officers settles all questions which in any way affect the final disposition of the decedent's estate. This duty of the government is paternal in its character. It will be easily perceived that innumerable questions are likely to arise in respect to the rights of the persons, who, under the law, are interested in the decedent's estate; dis-

putes and controversies must be of frequent occurrence, in which difficult problems of law will intrude themselves and are to be solved by the government authorities. Questions of a purely business character must be answered, helpless persons, such as infants, the insane and very old people, are to be protected, and after they are marshalled before the governmental authorities the estate of the dead man must be divided between them.

The scheme of the State governments in this country for the distribution of decedents' estates is fashioned after that of England. In New York State the officer elected by the people to whom full power and jurisdiction is delegated by the government in the premises is called the Surrogate. This officer, as the title of his office indicates, acts in the place of another, viz., in the place of and for the State government. The history of this office is most interesting and instructive, and the reader is referred to the opinion of the learned and eminent Chief Justice Charles P. Daly in the Matter of Brick's Estate.* Judge Daly traces the jurisdiction of this office from the earliest settlement of this State and explains the functions, duties and powers of the Surrogate. Many and important changes have been made by the legislature of this State since the creation of this office, until we have now a Court of Record in the city and county of New York presided over by two Surrogates whose jurisdiction is confined to the probate of wills, the appointment of executors, administrators, trustees and guardians, the control of these officers and the supervision of their official acts. The jurisdiction of this court is limited by statute, but within its domain of authority it has the widest jurisdiction and the broadest powers of any court. Here what is called natural justice and equity have full sway. The Surrogate has the right (it has been held by the Court of Appeals) to decree upon equitable principles and upon principles of justice and reason. The Surrogate is both a ministerial and a judicial officer and with him is lodged ample power to limit litigation in his court to actual and honest differences, to check and prevent captious disputes and speculative proceedings.

How then shall the increase of testamentary litigation be checked ? The answer in the concrete is that the Surrogate should be conscious of his authority and power and should fearlessly enforce both with the single purpose of doing justice to all. His

*15 Abbott Practice Reports 12.

duty is plainly set forth in the statutes and the decisions of the appellate courts, and an earnest and conscientious effort on his part to fulfill all the obligations of his office will reduce litigation in his court to the settlement of honest differences.

As this paper is written for laymen, not for lawyers, I have thought best to go somewhat into the detail of the procedure in the Surrogate's Court, so that the reader will perceive the precise truth of my proposition, that the strongest check to testamentary litigation is the Surrogate himself. His authority and his duty are undoubted. In a very recent case the Court of Appeals used these words in regard to the Surrogate: "The Code invests him with the broad jurisdiction to direct and control the conduct and settle the accounts of executors and administrators, and to administer justice in all matters relating to the affairs of decedents."

All of the property in the great city and county of New York owned by natural persons must pass by devolution of its title through the Surrogate's Court. At the death of the owner, the title to his personal property becomes vested in his personal representative, that is to say, in his administrator, if he dies without a will, or in his executor if he leaves a will naming an executor. His real property, such as houses and lands, descends to his heirs-at-law if he dies intestate, and if he leaves a will it passes according to the terms thereof. It rarely if ever happens that the decedent has succeeded in satisfying everybody with the provisions of his will, except in the case of a sole legatee. I have never known of an objection from a person holding that relation to the will. The rule is that the will is a disappointment to many who had expected a benefaction, and a sense of personal wrong oftentimes induces a contest on their part. There is probably no department in the administration of justice where so little is really known to the public of the rights and remedies of persons interested as that which has to do with the settlement of decedents' estates. Many intelligent persons do not realize the absolute right both in morals and in law of a man to dispose of all of his property by a paper executed by him in his lifetime, to take effect only at his death and which is defined to be his last will and testament. His right to so dispose of his property is as certain and sacred as his right to dispose of it by sale or gift during his life. None of his kin would think for a moment of questioning a transfer of property in his lifetime, but at his

death those who have not been remembered in his will, as it seems to them they should have been, are at once strongly impressed with the belief or the hope, in most cases, that the testator was of unsound mind and incapable of making a will, or that he was unduly influenced by some wicked person to make a will which did not include them as beneficiaries. Then commences the bitterest of all quarrels—the family quarrel. Resort is had in these contests many times to calumny and slander both of the dead and the living. Greed for money often induces false swearing and in many cases rank perjury. The most sacred of family affairs and family secrets are paraded before the world in the hope, usually vain I am glad to say, that the will of the dead man shall be rejected, his last wishes disregarded and defied, and any *modicum* of his property which may be left after paying the expenses of the litigation given over to them. A most wholesome check to this kind of testamentary litigation, in my own view, would be the insistence of the Surrogate that the case be promptly tried, the trial to proceed from day to day until the end is reached, whereupon he should at once decide, stating as briefly as practicable his reasons, both on the facts and the law. By pursuing this course the prime object of many contestants, to delay and harass the proponents of the will for the purpose of forcing a settlement which shall give them some valuable interest in the estate, is defeated.

Many wills are contested with no honest belief on the part of the contestants that the will was not lawfully executed, their real motive often being the gratification of spite and spleen with the hope that in the course of the proceeding something may turn up to their advantage. Their chief reliance, however, is upon delay. Contests of this sort are not very prevalent, and if the Surrogate will severely denounce them from the bench and will charge the costs of the contest against the contestants personally, as he has the right to do, and enforce his decree in that regard by such powers as are conferred upon him by law, proceedings of this character will be in good faith founded upon facts which will justify in the mind of a reasonable man careful investigation.

I do not intend to produce the impression that all persons interested in the decedent's estate shall not have full and fair chance to investigate in a proceeding for that purpose the *factum* of his will, but I do mean that their objections shall be made in good faith, not for a fishing expedition, not for delay, not to co-

erce a settlement (but another name for blackmail), and that they shall be ready within a reasonably short time to substantiate them by legal evidence.

In all cases where the decedent has left his property, or a considerable portion of it, to strangers, to the exclusion of his children or his wife, his brothers and sisters, father and mother, the will is said to be unnatural and a careful scrutiny of all the facts and circumstances by the Surrogate is required. Contests of such wills are rarely ever in bad faith, although they do not often succeed, because it is the policy of the law, which is consonant with reason and sense, that the decedent may dispose of his property according to the dictates of his own conscience, or even in absolute defiance of conscience and against the plainest and most sacred of moral or family obligations, so long as it be the fact that his will was his own free act, done at a time when his mental capacity had not been practically destroyed.

If the Surrogate will take pains to explain in clear language to the assembled relatives of the deceased person the really simple and just doctrines of the law, upon the application of which their rights depend, he will usually put an end to further litigation in that particular case. Such action by the Surrogate would so enlighten the understanding and reason of the parties that the litigious contestant would find his support taken away, and the unworthy attorney who is so often the procuring cause of the contest, with no interest to serve but his own, will no longer be able to deceive the credulous with his lurid tales of certain success in the appellate court. Another thought on this subject, in connection with the probate of wills, impels me to suggest that much testamentary litigation is induced by the peculiar jurisdiction of the General Term of the Supreme Court over all proceedings in the Surrogate's Court. The statute gives the General Term of the Supreme Court original jurisdiction over all proceedings in the Surrogate's Court; that is to say, the trial of a will contest in the Surrogate's Court may be treated by the General Term on an appeal as an idle ceremony, and the whole proceeding, so far as evidence is concerned, may be held for naught and proceedings *de novo* had in that court, or the proceeding may be continued in that court from the point where the Surrogate disposed of it, that court having the right to recall witnesses and examine new ones. This, in my opinion, is an

unwise and burdensome provision of the statute and ought to be repealed.

When the Surrogate was but a ministerial officer such jurisdiction of the General Term was necessary; but the Surrogate's Courts are now Courts of Record, and there is no reason why they should not have all the authority of any of the superior courts of record of any of the cities and counties of the State. It is the settled rule of decision that the findings of fact upon a trial before a jury, a judge at Special Term, or a referee, where there is a conflict of evidence, cannot be set aside upon any appeal in any court. This rule I state broadly, which fairly answers my purpose; but in a will case, or any other for that matter, in the Surrogate's Court, presided over by a magistrate who, as the statute defines, is a judge, the General Term is not bound by his findings of fact where there was a conflict of evidence before him.

Parties litigant and their attorneys are well aware of this condition of the law and they are prompt to avail themselves of it, if there is the shadow of a chance that a different finding on the evidence laid in before the Surrogate may be secured. The reason for the rule that the findings of a jury, judge or referee are final where there was a conflict of evidence applies, I submit, with greater force even to a Surrogate's Court as at present constituted than it does to courts of common law. The statute now under consideration is a direct invitation to any disappointed suitor in a Surrogate's Court to put the decedent's estate to delay and expense and unreasonable litigation. The citizen should have his day in court, that is, his one opportunity to submit his case, but he has no right to more. This opportunity, or day in court, as it is called, should be given at the earliest possible moment, and a speedy trial and a prompt decision should be had. This is my notion of the proper administration of justice. Complex and tardy proceedings with the rights of parties tried piecemeal and in different courts should not be tolerated.

It is an interesting fact in this connection that the General Term of the Supreme Court has more than once refused to entertain an action for the settlement of an executor's account, except where construction of a trust provision of the will is required, upon the sole ground that the Surrogate's Court has exclusive jurisdiction of such matters, whilst the same court under

the statute I have referred to has the right (and exercises it, too) of reviewing the Surrogate's findings of fact on a conflict of evidence. In other words, the Supreme Court has not jurisdiction in an action brought for that purpose to settle the accounts of an executor and distribute the estate with the exception stated, but the appellate branch of the court has jurisdiction to try *de novo* the *factum* of a will notwithstanding that the same has been carefully investigated by the Surrogate's Court with all the great advantage of a personal examination of the witnesses.

Another most important check to the increase of testamentary litigation would result if persons who make wills appreciated the fact that they cannot continue in the management of their property after death. The proneness of everybody to make a most elaborate will providing by a system of trust provisions for accumulation of income, powers to executors and trustees to invest and sell, and the establishment of continuing charities is fraught with great danger of almost ceaseless litigation and endless expense. Wills are prepared by testators having large estates so complex in their conditions that executors are unable to understand them, and are therefore compelled to seek the opinion of the court in an action for their construction. Such actions are very frequent, are always costly to the estate and rarely ever satisfactory to anybody but the court.

Our law libraries are groaning under the weight of text books and reported decisions of courts of intermediate and appellate jurisdiction, all devoted to the task of explaining the meaning and legal effect of wills. It seems to me a man about to make a will should realize the fact that when his will becomes operative he will no longer have any interest in the property left behind, and that any attempt on his part to keep control of it or of its earnings is utterly impracticable and foolish. He should dispose of his estate in the simplest way. If he be very wealthy and philanthropic, public spirited or charitable, or all three, let him administer his own estate by giving it away in his lifetime to his chosen objects vesting in his donees the title absolutely. To my mind the testator unwittingly invites and encourages litigation by appointing several executors and trustees, either the same persons or different ones. If the estate be a large one with divers trusts to execute, investments and sales to effectuate, disagreement and contention is certain to happen among these representatives,

all of which would be avoided if but one executor had been chosen. Again, I believe the choice of natural persons to serve in these capacities is a bad one. Many women are named as executrices of wills, and it is my experience that they know little or nothing of business, rely largely upon their emotions and intuitions and fall an easy prey to the ever ready, and always convenient, confidence man and sharper. My own judgment is that women should never be compelled or permitted to undergo the labor and responsibilities of these positions. I am of opinion that good safe trust companies are the best executors, etc., and by far the best guardians of the estates of infants.

The limits of this paper do not permit any further elaboration of my views upon this subject. Considerable progress, however, has been made in recent years in the reduction of litigation.

In the year 1888 the number of wills offered for probate in the City and County of New York was	1,375
Of this number there we contested	131
Rejected	7
In the year 1889 wills offered for probate	1,385
Contested	81
Rejected	11
In the year 1890 wills offered for probate	1,577
Contested	93
Rejected	6
In the year 1891 wills offered for probate	1,600
Contested	101
Rejected	11
In the year 1892 wills offered for probate	1,541
Contested	83
Rejected	6

The materiality of these figures and the application to be made will be plain to the reader. A further fact I should state, that of this whole number of contests, four hundred and eighty-nine, or more than two in each week of the eleven months of each of the business years, there has been but one reversal, and that was upon a question of fact simply.

The literal meaning of the subject of this paper excludes any observations upon another branch of the business in the Surrogate's Court. But I think a few words in regard to the accounts of executors, administrators, guardians and trustees are appropriate and material. The branch of business in the Surrogate's Court most pregnant with opportunity for litigation, a perfect breeder in fact of disputes and contentions, is that which includes the settlement of the accounts of executors, administrators, guardians, trustees, etc. The Surrogate, as I have already shown, has control of these officers. It is his duty to protect them

in the honest discharge of their trusts and to call them to strict account for any wilful or grossly negligent omission of duty. The office of the executor and trustee is not of his own seeking, and at the best his is a thankless task, with utterly inadequate compensation in most cases. The rule of law applicable to this officer is reasonable and beneficent. The Surrogate should ever bear in mind the maxim "that whom the testator trusts, so will the law," and applying the spirit of this maxim to the conduct of the trustee or executor he will have no difficulty in doing justice to him and to the persons interested in the estate of decedent. The accounts of these officers are really very simple and easily kept, and there should rarely be any good ground of objection thereto. An important check to litigation in this department of business is the prompt condemnation by the Surrogate of slack or faithless performance of duty by the executor, a stern rebuke of all extravagance and the surcharging of his account with all sums which have been unlawfully expended by him, and in any extreme case depriving him of all commissions and charging the costs of his accounting against him personally. Idle and captious objections to his account, which are not infrequent, should be dismissed at once and the costs of the proceeding charged against the objectant personally and their payment enforced. A plain, brief statement by the Surrogate of the law in the case should be made and his decision promptly rendered. If this course is pursued the public will very soon become enlightened, if not fully educated.

Another great check to testamentary litigation would be the trial of all issues by the Surrogate in person. The delegation by him of the functions and duties of his office is a vice in our judicial system. It is supposed by many lawyers that the Surrogate is relieved of much labor in a proceeding sent to a referee; whether this be true or not, and I doubt it, the answer is: Give us more Surrogates if the number we have are not equal to the volume of business. The expense and delay of a reference is often almost scandalous, and in the majority of cases is a torment and an outrage to all concerned.

The law which governs and directs the Surrogate in the discharge of his duties is in the main adequate for all purposes. Some amendments which I suggested to the legislature this winter will no doubt be enacted, and will serve to effect a more prompt settlement of the affairs of decedents.

RASTUS S. RANSOM.

DISAPPEARING DICKENSLAND.

BY CHARLES DICKENS.

Among the vast number of queer businesses in which people somehow or other manage to pick up a decent livelihood in London there is one which is hardly known to Londoners themselves, and but little known even to visitors from other parts of England, but with which a great number of enthusiastic American travellers are pretty well acquainted. Indeed, it is not too much to say that it is almost entirely among the pilgrims to English literary shrines and the indefatigable and omnivorous general sightseers from the great Western Continent that the professors of this singular and deceptive industry find their prey.

For it must be owned at the outset that, although in the ordinary conduct of their lives these people are fairly honest, perhaps, as the world goes, there is something of a predatory nature in their public career, and that the flights of fancy in which their peculiar avocation compels them to indulge are occasionally—I might almost say generally—very near akin to downright mendacity. It may be pleaded in mitigation of this somewhat severe judgment that long intercourse and familiarity with works of fiction have developed among them more brilliant imaginations, a higher inventive faculty and keener eyes for the picturesque than are found in ordinary mortals; but the fact after all remains that more thorough-paced disciples of Ananias and Sapphira than the guides to what is called Dickensland in London it would be difficult to find in all that vast army of untrustworthy people who have taken the great sights and shrines of the world into their peculiar keeping.

As a matter of fact, the London of the early books of Charles Dickens is, practically, as Mrs. Curdle said of the drama, "gone, absolutely gone." Very little even remains of most of the places described in the later works. Dickensland in London, indeed, has nowadays hardly any more real existence than the Garden of

the Hesperides or the Island of Atlantis. But what does that matter? The transatlantic pilgrim to the shrine of the master clamors to be shown the house in which Mr. Pickwick lived, the court in which Mr. Krook made such a very uncomfortable end of it, the actual public-house which displayed Mr. Samuel Weller's extensive and peculiar knowledge of London in so remarkable a degree, the Old Curiosity Shop, Tom-all-alone's, the Wooden Midshipman and all the rest of it. Why should he not be gratified? It is true that a great many places of this kind were absolutely incapable of certain identification at any time, and that almost all the originals of those which were actually portraits have been swept from the face of the earth in the course of the extraordinary changes which have practically given us in fifty years a new London on the ruins of the old. But the demand inevitably creates the supply. Old illusions die hard. Dickensland lives again in the vivid imagination of the guides, and the truth of the old saying again asserts itself—*populus vult decipi et decipitur*. A curious instance of the way in which people are sometimes quite unconsciously and innocently led into error in these matters is to be found in John Forster's *Life of Charles Dickens*. Mr. Forster gives a picture of Tavistock House, which is, no doubt, accepted as a faithful representation of the house as it was when Charles Dickens lived in it. But, as a matter of fact, it is not. A later tenant added a portico, or porch, to the street door; and this portico, of which Charles Dickens knew nothing, figures in the picture. This is, perhaps, a trivial matter; but many of the Dickensland traditions have received credence on very similar, and equally inaccurate, grounds. Thus, for instance, to take a case outside London, local tradition at the little seaside village of Broadstairs in Kent has given the name Bleak House to the house on the cliff above the harbor, in which Charles Dickens lived during two or three summers, and which, in his time, was known as Fort House; and the legend—implicitly believed in those parts—is that *Bleak House* was written there. In point of fact, although much of Charles Dickens's work was done at Broadstairs—notably, as regards *David Copperfield*—it so happens that *Bleak House* was one of the books on which no work whatever was done in Fort House.

That there is really little or nothing left of what may fairly be called Dickensland in the London of to-day, a rapid survey of a

few of the books which afford the guides their most popular and remunerative examples will amply prove.

The *Sketches*—to begin with the beginning—were written some fifty-seven years ago, and it is natural that the scenes described, and the manners and customs of the actors in them, should have changed considerably in so long a period. But how the whole thing has been actually swept away is nothing less than astonishing.

"A few years hence," Charles Dickens wrote in the description of Scotland Yard, "and the antiquary of another generation, looking into some mouldy record of the strife and passion that agitated the world in these times, may glance his eye over the pages we have just filled ; and not all his knowledge of the history of the past, not all his black-letter lore, or his skill in book collecting, not all the dry studies of a long life, or the dusty volumes that have cost him a fortune may help him to the whereabouts either of Scotland Yard or of any of the landmarks we have mentioned in describing it." This prediction has been amply and speedily verified. Scotland Yard still exists, it is true, but the street of handsome buildings which leads from Whitehall to Northumberland Avenue has nothing but the name in common with the old world "territory, which was first accidentally discovered by a country gentleman who lost his way in the Strand," and the "landmarks" have fared as badly. Northumberland House has gone altogether, and its site is occupied by the Grand Hotel and the northern end of Northumberland Avenue ; the new market, the springing up of which at Hungerford is described as having first given the signal of change in Scotland Yard, itself made way for Charing Cross Railway Station in 1862 ; the Hungerford Suspension Bridge, which was not constructed until nine years after the date of the *Sketches*, was transported to Clifton near Bristol, at the same time. Absolutely no trace of the old place remains.

Following the *Sketches* in order, we find Seven Dials still existing, little altered in their main features but still considerably improved ; but the famous old clothes shops of Monmouth Street have gone the way of most of the frowsy slums of a like nature. Except as to the entrance from St. Paul's Churchyard and what is called Dean's Court, where some of the old buildings have been preserved, the same fate has attended Doctors Com-

mons, the courts, so familiar to us through *David Copperfield*, were destroyed in 1867; the successors of Mr. Spenlow and the "coves in white aprons," to whom the elder Mr. Weller fell so easy a prey, have vanished together into space. There is still a theatre on the site of Astley's, but it is not the same as that in which Christopher Nubbles and his family and friends made such delightful holiday—nor, it may be incidentally mentioned, would it be possible for any gentleman in Kit's position to give that remarkable oyster supper nowadays for the simple reason that the price of oysters in London has increased in direct proportion to the increase of London itself.

Londoners get so many holidays in these days—and use them so much better than was too often the case in the old time—that they no longer require "a periodical breaking out. . . . A sort of spring rash; a three days' fever which cools the blood for six months afterwards, and at the expiration of which London is restored to its old habits of plodding industry as suddenly and completely as if nothing had ever happened to disturb them," to quote the *Sketches'* description of Greenwich Fair, and it is perhaps fortunate that this should be so, for Greenwich Fair was abolished as a crying nuisance many years ago. A more permanent, and, in its way, more respectable form of outdoor recreation, practically vanished when the public got tired of Vauxhall—celebrated by Thackeray both in *Vanity Fair* and *Pendennis*—and the "Royal Property," as it was called, was parcelled out into building lots, and when its sometime rival, Cremorne, which, oddly enough, is not mentioned by Charles Dickens, was also swallowed up by the advance of the enterprising London builder in the course of the sixties. The ill-contrived, ill-arranged, ill-constructed criminal courts at the Old Bailey still remain, as crying a disgrace to the greatest and wealthiest city in the world as ever. The prison of Newgate is not yet pulled down, but is practically disused and is to disappear into the limbo of London memories before very long, and, though it is still used as a place of execution, the miserable business is now done privately instead of in the presence of the horrible crowd which used to fill the open space before the frowning walls on "hanging Mondays" in the bad old time. The Samuel Wilkins of to-day could not take Miss Jemima Evans to the "Eagle," for that place of amusement—afterwards, in the hands of John Rouse, and, later, of the two Conquests, father and son, famous

as the "Grecian theatre"—has passed into the hands of the Salvation Army, and its concerts nowadays are provided only by the singularly inharmonious brazen instruments and flabby big drums in which the followers of General Booth appear to take so weird a delight, while the dancing platform in the garden, if it is used at all, must needs be utilized exclusively for the corybantic exercises of tambourine-pointing Hallelujah Lasses and Happy Elizas. As for the "White Conduit," where Miss Amelia Martin realized all the bitterness of ill-considered and disappointed ambition, its place knew it no more, and its site in Pentonville was built over, years ago.

It will be noticed that almost every place of amusement mentioned in the *Sketches* has disappeared entirely, and even a casual observer cannot fail to see that the amusements of the great mass of the London people have at the same time changed altogether. The Vauxhalls and Cremornes have gone, and, even if they had survived for a few years longer, would inevitably have been suppressed by the wisdom of our municipal rulers, who have decided that public dancing-places shall be tabooed, and would like, if they could, to refuse any refreshment but tea and lemonade to the visitors to the Crystal Palaces and Earl's Courts which have taken the place of the old pleasure resorts. To some extent the change may be and, I suppose, must be admitted to be for the better, but that the people of that day enjoyed themselves in simpler fashion than we do, and were content with a great deal less in the way of amusement—and spent very much less money in the process—than is demanded now must be patent to any reader of the *Sketches*. The monstrous growth of London and the enormously increased facilities for moving about, which have of late years been provided by railways, omnibuses, and trams, have made it almost impossible for the modern Londoner to take his pleasure, such as it is, except in droves and mobs, and I doubt very much whether our people really get half as much enjoyment for their money as their simpler-minded and more easy-going ancestors got out of their cheaper and far less frequent holidays and diversions.

The troubles of the Pickwickian explorer of Dickensland in London begin very early in his career, and the aspect of Goswell Street, now known as Goswell Road, which will meet him on the very threshold, is calculated to inflict upon him a severe shock to

his feelings. It is difficult to imagine how a gentleman of means, such as Mr. Pickwick is described to have been, could ever have taken up his abode in this noisy, bustling, and, if the truth must be told, decidedly unpleasant thoroughfare, or how Sergeant Buzfuz, even in the loftiest and most poetical flights of his eloquence, could ever have associated it with anything in the nature of tranquillity and retirement. And, even bearing in mind the fact that Mrs. Bardell's establishment was of a very modest kind, it would certainly require the boldest and most determined of guides to pitch upon any house in the Goswell Road as that from which Mr. Pickwick emerged on the memorable "thirteenth of May, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-seven." But the look of the thing changes when it is remembered that at that time Islington, which lies at the northern extremity of the Goswell Road, was a pleasant, outlying village ; that the fields and lanes of Pentonville, Stoke Newington, Highbury, Hornsey, and Highgate were within an easy walk of Mr. Pickwick's lodging, and that the miles and miles of streets which now separate the Goswell Road from the open country were not even thought of.

Possibly, as our traveller drives disappointed to the Golden Cross, he will wonder how ever Mr. Pickwick managed to have that instructive conversation with the cabman, which would under present arrangements be quite impossible, until he remembers that in those days the cabman sat on a kind of perch just outside the cab and handy for conversation with the fare, and recognizes, as he probably will, the infinite superiority of the modern hansom over the ancient "cabriolet;" while it will afford him food for reflection to consider that the prototype of the crowd of omnibuses through which he threads his way did not make its appearance in the streets of London until the 4th of July, 1829—just about the time, indeed, that Mr. Pickwick had completed the sowing of his rather late crop of wild oats and had settled down at Dulwich.

As to the Golden Cross, that is only represented to-day by a comparatively modern hotel opposite Charing Cross station. The old Golden Cross was cleared away in 1829 or 1830 to make room for the present Trafalgar Square, which has itself been transmogrified in the course of time to such an extent that anybody who has to revisit it now after an absence of five and twenty years or so would scarcely recognize the place but for the Nelson Column, the National Gallery, and St. Martin's Church.

Up to about six years ago there was still enough left of the old White Hart Inn in the Borough to swear by, for, although the buildings on the south side of the yard had been replaced by an exceedingly modern public-house, some of the old galleries and tiled roofs on the north and east still looked down forlornly on the pilgrim. Now there is not even that much consolation left. The whole place has been swept away, and is as unrecognizable as the "Belle Sauvage" on Ludgate Hill, the Pickwickian associations with which were long ago dissipated by the erection of a great printing office on the site of the house at which Mr. Weller, Senior, stopped "ven he drove up," and which has only left its name as a puzzle to antiquaries. But if the White Hart is gone, a few doors farther to the southward there yet lingers a considerable portion of one of those typical old taverns, "The George" by name, and any one who wishes to know just what the extinct White Hart was like would do well to pay a visit to this quaint old hostelry. The yard has been annexed by a railway company as a depot for the receipt of goods, but all that part of the house which lies to the south is in admirable preservation, and "The George," although not the rose itself, is at all events nearly next door to it.

The dry arches of Waterloo Bridge, which were so highly eulogized by Mr. Samuel Weller as a "fine sleeping place—within ten minutes walk of all the public offices—only if there is an objection to it it is that the situation is raythor too airy," still exist, it is true, but as they were utilized for warehouses, stables, and so on shortly after Mr. Weller's time they do not now offer any points of interest to the explorer, and the "Fox-under-the-Hill" tavern in the immediate neighborhood—where Mr. Roker's friend Teddy Martin "whopped the coalheaver"—was disestablished by the Victoria Embankment, and the last traces of it have been swept away by the vast alterations now going on between the Strand and the Embankment at the foot of Cecil and Salisbury streets.

It is of no use for the Dickens student to allow his guide to take him into the city in search of Messrs. Dodson & Fogg's offices in Freeman's Court,—they were pulled down four and thirty years ago: and I should very much doubt his succeeding in the discovery of that "second court on the right hand side —last house on the same side of the vay," the close aquaintance with which, extending even to an intimate familiarity with the

peculiarities of the "box as stands in the first fire-place," stamped Mr. Weller's knowledge of London as being extensive and peculiar. It was about six or seven and thirty years ago that I first began my quest after that box in the first fire-place, and as I have never been able to come across it I presume it must have been improved off the face of the earth very soon after Mr. Weller's time.

There is a George Yard off Lombard Street to this day, but it is a very different George Yard to that in which the George and Vulture was situated—Mr. Pickwick surely had odd tastes in the way of lodging—and the site of the hotel is now occupied by a part of the City Conservative Club, all that remains of the old place being its name on the door post of an adjoining chop house. The Blue Boar in Leadenhall Market, where they were so well acquainted with the elder Mr. Weller's ways, fared as badly when the narrow congeries of ramshackle lanes and alleys, which until quite recently contained the old market, were wiped out by the fine buildings of the present one. Hard by, the little timber midshipman—"that which might be called, familiarly, the woodenest, that which thrust itself out above the pavement, right leg foremost, with a suavity the least endurable, and had the shoe buckles and flapped waistcoat the least reconcilable to human reason, and bore at its right eye the most offensively disproportionate piece of machinery"—no longer stands "taking observations of the hackney coaches" from the side of Sol Gills's door in Leadenhall Street; and the street itself and all the buildings in it are changed beyond recognition. There is no room any more in Bevis Marks for Mr. Sampson Brass's residence, the parlor window of which was so close upon the footway that the passenger who took the wall brushed the dim glass with his coat sleeve. Bevis Marks is now a fairly broad street of warehouses and other well-to-do places of business, and one would as soon expect to see a giraffe in "The Marks" as a Punch and Judy show. Further to the southward again people walk about in Todgers's neighborhood—or what would be Todgers's neighborhood if Todgers's still existed—as easily as they walk about anywhere else. It is no longer the fate of the pedestrian in this quarter to "grope his way for an hour through lanes and by-ways, and court-yards and passages," and never once to emerge "upon anything that might be reasonably called a street." Lanes and by-ways, court-yards and pas-

sages, all the "devious mazes" of the district have been carted away, and nothing remains but the monument, now the centre of quite a respectable open space, to remind us that M. Todgers once kept house and wrestled with the commercial gentlemen's appetite for gravy close by; while it is enough to give one look only at Cannon Street to feel that it is no longer the place for the "somewhat similar" establishment to which Mr. Jinkins took occasion to refer after a certain memorable dinner at which Todgers's showed what it could do when it tried.

A very happy hunting-ground for the sojourner in Dickensland in London used to be the unsavory neighborhood "in the vicinity of Clare Market and closely approximating to the back of New Inn," wherein was situated the Magpie and Stump Tavern, in which Mr. Lowton entertained Mr. Pickwick in so singular a manner, and I take it that more impossible guesses and audacious taradiddles have been gravely offered to the unsuspecting traveller in this particular portion of Dickensland than in any other. For not only did the shabby, dirty, noisome courts and alleys of which these particular slums were composed—and almost all of which have been quite recently pulled down—answer to many of Charles Dickens's descriptions of low neighborhoods; not only were there here many taverns which might well have stood for the "Magpie and Stump"—I think, indeed, that the "weather-beaten sign-board" bearing "the half obliterated semblance of a magpie intently eyeing a crooked streak of brown paint which the neighbors had been taught from infancy to consider as the stump" really was still in existence up to a comparatively recent date; but just round the corner, as it were, where Portsmouth Street joins Lincoln's Inn Fields, is the choicest and most generally believed in of all the bogus Dickens sights. This is a mean little building, now used as a waste-paper store, which describes itself as the veritable Old Curiosity Shop "immortalized by Charles Dickens," and which has about as much to do with the genuine building—if Nell's home had any actual brick and mortar original — as the Capitol in Washington itself. Curiosity shops were not such rarities in 1840 that it was important to take any particular specimen as a model to begin with, but let anybody recall the descriptions of the Old Curiosity Shop itself in the earlier chapters of the book, carefully consider Cattermole's illustrations, and then take stock of that claimant to the

title which is now under consideration, and I think he will have as little hesitation in arriving at the conclusion that the Portsmouth Street building is a complete fraud as I have myself. There is a description of a "small, dull yard" below the old man's window, for one thing, which puts the whole matter beyond doubt, seeing that the very few windows in the house in Portsmouth Street look direct into the roadway; while the statement in the book that the "back parlour was very far removed from the old man's chamber," and the consideration of the circumstances that there were in the Curiosity Shop of the book two rooms on the ground floor besides the shop, and that in the Portsmouth Street house there could not be any possibility of finding room for a tenth part of the grandfather's stock-in-trade, seem to knock the final nails into the coffin of Portsmouth Street. And if any further evidence is considered necessary it will be found, I think, in the description of the deserted house as "a dull barrier dividing the glaring lights and bustle of the streets into two long lines." There are not many glaring lights and not much bustle in Portsmouth Street, and if there were, they could not, by any stretch of the imagination, make "two long lines."

Not very far off, across Lincoln's Inn Fields and New Square, Lincoln's Inn, is an undoubtedly genuine bit of Dickensland, however; not long to remain it may be feared, as a great deal of pulling down and rebuilding are going on in the neighborhood, but well worth looking at while it lasts. This is the court in which Mr. Krook lived. It can be approached either by the little gate about midway in the east side of New Square, through which Miss Flite conducted "The Wards in Jarndyce," or by a passage adjoining the Three Tuns public-house in Chancery Lane, just opposite Bream's Buildings. It is known to ordinary mortals as Chichester Rents, and at the Lincoln's Inn end of it stands the Old Ship Tavern, which, I have no doubt whatever, was the original of the Sol's Arms. A careful and interesting article in the *St. James's Gazette* of June 27, 1892, claims the corner house opposite (Nos. 8 and 9) as Mr. Krook's, and relies for evidence especially on the fact that no other house in the court has an attic with an outside parapet—"Lady Jane," the Lord Chancellor's cat crouched "on the parapet outside for hours and hours" seeking to devour Miss Flite's birds, it will be remembered. But against that is to be set in

strict fairness the fact that we have it in Mr. Krook's own words that the Sol's Arms was "next door," while the coroner in the course of the inquest on Mr. Krook himself speaks of the "unlucky house next door;" and we are therefore compelled to conclude that "over the way" and "next door" were interchangeable terms both with Mr. Krook and the coroner, or to admit that it is absurd in considering such matters as this to insist on an absolute photographic accuracy in matters of detail. It is enough—or ought to be enough, of course it is not enough for the genuine enthusiast—that a place should bear sufficient resemblance to a description in one of the books to enable us to say with tolerable certainty, this is the scene which suggested so and so to the writer. To insist upon every brick, or on the absolute identification of every detail; to suppose that Charles Dickens held himself down in such cases to mere literal description, bringing to it no imagination or invention of his own, is manifestly absurd. And it seems to me that a judgment based on these considerations will be in favor of Chichester Rents, just as it will not admit the claims of the Old Curiosity Shop in Portsmouth Street. Chichester Rents has a rival claimant, by the bye, in Bishop's Court, a little to the northward. But what little remains—and it is not much—of the old houses in Bishop's Court only seems to point to the greater authenticity of "The Rents."

The particular *Bleak House* scenes associated with this neighborhood, it may be added, are very easily to be identified. There is no difficulty in recognizing Took's Court, Cursitor Street, as Mr. Snagsby's Cook's Court, for instance, and as yet the march of improvement has left there many houses, any one of which may well be that over which the "little woman" ruled with so iron a rod. The Courts of Chancery have been cleared away and their business has been transferred to the great legal palace in the Strand—that triumph of ill-arrangement and inconvenience which might almost be the work of the Court of Chancery itself—but the original of Mr. Tulkinghorn's chambers would not be hard to find somewhere about No. 58 Lincoln's Inn Fields; while farther west, half-way down Russell Court, which leads from Drury Lane to Catherine Street, are the "reeking little tunnel of a court," the steps which Jo swept so carefully and so cleanly because "he was so wery good to me, he was," and the "beastly scrap of ground" in which they buried Captain Haw-

don. There is no offence about the little tunnel of a court now, the burying-ground has been asphalted over and is a playground for children, but that the little churchyard out of Russell Court was that which Charles Dickens had in his mind when he selected a last resting-place for poor "Nemo" cannot, I think, reasonably be doubted. As for Tom-all-Alone's, better supervision, sanitary and police—and especially the passing of Lord Shaftesbury's Common Lodging-Houses Act in 1851—have cut Tom's claws and generally trimmed him up a good deal, but there are still many courts and alleys between Catherine Street and Lincoln's Inn Fields which would be unsafe enough in the daytime, and absolutely dangerous at night, for well-dressed people, not being doctors, nurses, sisters of charity, or scripture readers. Across Holborn, to the northward, Kingsgate Street still lingers precariously. Before long, no doubt, it will take the prevailing infection from the broad, new street at its northern end and burst out into that peculiar modern red brick which, like a sort of scarlet-building-fever, has seized upon so much of the neighborhood, but a fairly lively imagination can still make out Mrs. Gamp's first floor, which was so "easily assailable at night by pebbles, walking-sticks, and fragments of tobacco pipe"—although the modern successor of Mr. Sweedlepipe calls his shop a hairdressing saloon, and appears to have no connection in the bird line.

But I have wandered from the party at the Magpie and Stump and from Jack Bamber, whose stories about the old inns dealt with places of which Charles Dickens was very fond, and which are described in many of his books. Several of these will well repay a visit from the careful and enthusiastic Dickens student, for those which still survive have changed but little in the last fifty years. The Temple has been altered a great deal, it is true, but Fountain Court has been left pretty much as it was when it served as a place of meeting for Tom Pinch and Ruth, and many other of the Dickens scenes which are laid in the Temple can still be easily identified in the course of a stroll among the old buildings which still remain. Furniss's Inn is still very much as it was when John Westlock had that charming little dinner party there; a memorial tablet marks the house in which Charles Dickens wrote the greater part of *Pickwick;* there has been little or no change in Gray's Inn, since Traddles took the "dear-

est girl in the world" there after their marriage; Staple Inn and Barnard's Inn—the latter the dingiest collection of shabby buildings ever squeezed together in a rank corner as a club for tomcats—still real memories of Mr. Grewgious, Neville Landless, and Mr. Tartar, Pip, Herbert Pocket and Joe Gargery; while Clifford's Inn remains the dreariest of all the "shabby crew," as Charles Dickens called them. The extensive opening up which has been effected by the construction of Holborn Circus and the new streets in its vicinity has brought Thaives Inn out of its native obscurity; the archway through which Mr. Guppy conducted Esther Summerson to Mr. Jellyby's house has been removed, and the Inn is now one of the turnings out of the broad Circus itself. But it is still easily recognizable in bad weather as "a narrow street of high houses, like an oblong cistern to hold the fog," and has a curiously old-fashioned air among its brand new modern surroundings. Indeed, few of the localities in Dickensland in London answer more satisfactorily to the description than Thaives Inn. But a little way across the Circus are the splendid markets of Smithfield on the site of that disgraceful old cattle-market which seemed to Pip "all a-smear with filth, and fat, and blood, and foam," and which presented so desolate an appearance to Oliver Twist when he started on that terrible journey to Chertsey with Mr. Sikes. All the *Oliver Twist* district about here, it may be added, has disappeared as completely as Jacob's Island itself, not even a Holborn Hill or a Snow Hill—now connected by the Viaduct—remaining to serve as landmarks. Clement's Inn is being pulled down; New Inn is threatened with a like fate; the Globe and the Opera Comique Theatres occupy the site of Lyon's Inn; the place of Symond's Inn, where Mr. Vholes had his office, and where Richard Carstone lived after the Court of Chancery had cast its evil spell over him, knows it no more.

The Marshalsea Prison, which figured so conspicuously in one of Jack Bamber's stories, which reappeared still more prominently in *Little Dorrit*, and to the recollection of which the many sad incidents of Charles Dickens's boyhood give so much painful interest, has altogether gone. Some of its ruins were still standing in 1856, but no trace of it is now to be found, although local tradition—unaccompanied by any sort of proof—has it that some portions of the old prison still exist among the houses to the northward of St. George's Church, in the Borough High Street.

The Fleet prison was also pulled down long ago, and its site on the east side of the south end of Farringdon Street built over. With the debtors' prisons, and imprisonment for debt itself, have gone all the sponging houses about Cursitor Street — the Coavinses and others—and that mysterious institution known as the "Rules of the Bench," the memory of which has been preserved for us in "Nicholas Nickleby."

But it is not only individual houses belonging to Dickensland which have been lost to us in process of time. Whole neighborhoods have changed their nature; new and handsome quarters of the town have arisen, not only since the days of Mr. Pickwick, but since the death, only twenty-two years ago, of his creator himself. Trafalgar Square, as we have seen, dates only from about the close of Mr. Pickwick's career; the great work of the Victoria Embankment was not completed until 1870; the Northumberland Avenue change was of later date still. The Royal Exchange and the open space about it did not exist before 1844. The widening of the Poultry and Newgate street, the construction of the Holborn Viaduct, and the clearing away of Middle Row, Holborn, have made a fine thoroughfare which Mr. Pickwick would be quite unable to recognize as that along which he walked with Sam Weller from George Yard to Gray's Inn. Farringdon Street, Ludgate Circus, St. Bride Street, and New Bridge Street have completely changed all that neighborhood. The city has been absolutely transformed by the opening up of fine new streets in every direction. Shaftesbury Avenue, Theobald's Road, Rosebery Avenue, Victoria Street, the great market of Smithfield, and many other new streets and open spaces have made havoc of the networks of slums, the narrow thoroughfares and the intricate mazes of houses which people in the old days seemed to regard with perfect complacency. The Houses of Parliament, the Courts of Justice, and almost all of the theatres have been built, and half the parks of London have been made—not to mention the extension of the railway system—not only since Mr. Pickwick's time, but even in quite recent years.

It is needless to multiply instances. It is enough to recognize the fact that the greater part of the London of fifty years ago has vanished already, and that the requirements of a vastly increased and more exacting population demand still further and more sweeping changes. We shall be fortunate if we can even save

some of the great monuments of architectural art which were bequeathed to us by our forefathers; but as to Dickensland in London, that in the course of a very few years will exist only in the books themselves and in the notes of explorers and commentators.

CHARLES DICKENS.

A LOOK AHEAD.*

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE.

I THINK one excusable who has been compelled to live for months among figures and hard facts, and record only the past, if, his task accomplished, he indulges in a look ahead, where not what is but what is to be is considered, and where, being no longer bound by results achieved, he is fancy free.

I have taken this privilege freely for myself in this closing chapter, and, Utopian as the dream may seem, I place on record my belief that it is one day to become a reality.

Until a little more than a hundred years ago the English-speaking race dwelt together in unity, the American being as much a citizen of Britain as the Scotsman, Welshman or Irishman. A difference unhappily arose under the British Constitution, their common heritage, as to the right of the citizens of the older part of the state to tax their fellows in the newer part across the sea without their consent; but separation was not contemplated by Washington, Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, Jay, and other leaders. On the contrary, these great men never ceased to proclaim their loyalty to, and their desire to remain part of, Britain; and they disclaimed any idea of separation, which was indeed accepted at last, but only when forced upon them as a sad necessity from which there was no honorable escape if they were to maintain the rights they had acquired, not as American, but as British citizens.

On the other hand, the mother-land, which forced the issue upon her loyal citizens in America, sees nothing more clearly today than that she was in error, and that she converted a constitutional agitation for redress of grievances into a question of patriotic resistance to the exercise of unconstitutional power, an issue which Britons have never been slow to accept, and have never

* This article is the closing chapter of the new edition of "Triumphant Democracy"—embracing the results of the 1890 census—which is soon to be issued by Messrs. Charles Scribners' Sons.

failed successfully to meet. There is no British statesman who does not feel that if the Britons in America had not resisted taxation without representation and fought out the issue to the end, they would have been false to the blood in their veins.

I desire to give my readers in the old land and in the new some idea of the position of the two parties after the difference between them arose.

The following quotations from the credentials presented by the delegates from several of the American provinces to the First Continental Congress, organized September 5, 1774, show the spirit which then prevailed.

Delegates from the Province of New Hampshire were instructed

"To secure and to perpetuate their (the colonies') rights, liberties and privileges, and to restore that peace, harmony and mutual confidence which once happily subsisted between the parent country and her colonies."

Those of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, Samuel and John Adams among them, were charged to seek

"The restoration of union and harmony between Great Britain and the colonies, most ardently desired by all good men."

The great Province of Pennsylvania sent delegates for conference,

"And for establishing that union and harmony between Great Britain and the colonies, which is indispensably necessary to the welfare and happiness of both."

Virginia wished its delegates, among whom were Washington, Randolph and Lee,

"To secure British America from the ravage and ruin of arbitrary taxes, and speedily to procure the return of that harmony and union, so beneficial to the whole empire, and so ardently desired by all British America."

We quote now from addresses and petitions adopted by the Continental Congress.

From an address to the people of Great Britain, approved October 21, 1774, and written, according to Jefferson, by John Jay:

"We believe there is yet much virtue, much justice, much public spirit in the English nation. To that justice we now appeal. You have been told that we are seditious, impatient of government, and desirous of independency. Be assured that these are not facts but calumnies. Permit us to be as free as yourselves, and we shall ever esteem a union with you to be our greatest glory and our greatest happiness."

From the Petition of the Congress to the King :

"We ask but for peace, liberty, and safety. We wish not a diminution of the prerogative, nor do we solicit the grant of any new right in our favor. Your royal authority over us, and our connection with Great Britain, we shall always carefully and zealously endeavor to support and maintain."

On Monday, June 12, 1775, the Second Continental Congress passed a resolution for a fast, the battles of Lexington and Concord having just taken place, seeking aid

"To avert those desolating judgments with which we are threatened, and to bless our rightful sovereign, King George III."

From the declaration of Congress, setting forth the causes and necessity of taking up arms, adopted July 6, 1775, a few weeks after the battle of Bunker Hill :

"Lest this declaration should disquiet the minds of our friends and fellow subjects in any part of the empire, we assure them that we mean not to dissolve that union which has so long and so happily subsisted between us and which we sincerely wish to see restored. We have not raised armies with ambitious designs of separating from Great Britain and establishing independent states. We fight not for glory or for conquest."

From the Petition to the King dated July 8, 1775, signed by the members of the Congress present :

"Attached to Your Majesty's person, family and government with all the devotion that principle and affection can inspire, connected with Great Britain by the strongest ties that can unite societies, and deploring every event that tends in any degree to weaken them, we solemnly assure Your Majesty that we not only most ardently desire the former harmony between her and these colonies may be restored, but that a concord may be established between them upon so firm a basis as to perpetuate its blessings, uninterrupted by any future dissensions, to succeeding generations in both countries."

From an address to the inhabitants of Great Britain, also adopted by the Congress July 8 :

"We are accused of aiming at independence; but how is this accusation supported? By the allegations of your ministers, not by our actions. . . . Yet give us leave most solemnly to assure you that we have not yet lost sight of the object we have ever had in view, a reconciliation with you on constitutional principles, and a restoration of that friendly intercourse, which, to the advantage of both, we till lately maintained."

Thomas Jefferson wrote :

". . . I am sincerely one of those and would rather be in dependence on Great Britain, properly limited, than on any nation on earth, or than on no nation.

"Believe me, dear sir, there is not in the British Empire a man who more cordially loves a union with Great Britain than I do."

Benjamin Franklin testified before the Committee of the House of Commons :

"They (the colonists) consider themselves as a part of the British Empire, and as having one common interest with it; they may be looked on here as foreigners, but they do not consider themselves as such. They are zealous for the honor and prosperity of this nation; and, while they are well used, will always be ready to support it as far as their little power goes."—From the "Life of Franklin," by John Bigelow. Lippincott. Vol. I., page 495.

On July 13, 1774, Jay was appointed a member of a committee of New York citizens to draw up resolutions on the non-importation policy. This committee reported :

"That it is our greatest happiness and glory to have been born British subjects, and that we wish nothing more ardently than to live and die as such;" that "the Act for blocking up the port of Boston is . . . subversive of every idea of *British liberty*;" and that it should be left to the proposed Congress to determine the question of non-importation, which would be justified only by "dire necessity."—"John Jay," by George Pellew, pages 31 and 32.

While the British-Americans were thus proclaiming their love, affection and loyalty for the parent land, and pleading for British rights and the Union, we turn to those in Britain who are now regarded as the greatest and wisest statesmen of that time. Hear the words of Pitt :

"It is my opinion that this kingdom has no right to lay a tax upon the colonies. At the same time I assert the authority of this kingdom over the colonies to be sovereign and supreme, in every circumstance of government and legislation whatsoever. They are the subjects of this kingdom equally entitled with yourselves to all the natural rights of mankind, and the peculiar privileges of Englishmen; equally bound by its laws and equally participating in the constitution of this free country. The Americans are the sons, not the bastards of England. Taxation is no part of the governing or legislative power. The taxes are a voluntary gift and grant of the Commons alone. . . . When, therefore, in this House we give and grant, we give and grant what is our own. But in an American tax, what do we do? We, your Majesty's Commons for Great Britain, give and grant to your Majesty, what? Our own property? No. We give and grant to your Majesty the property of your Majesty's Commons in America. It is an absurdity in terms."—From a speech by William Pitt, afterwards Lord Chatham, in the House of Commons, January 16, 1776.

Let us hear Burke:

"No man ever doubted that the commodity of tea could bear an imposition of three pence. But no commodity will bear three pence, or will bear a penny, when the general feelings of men are irritated, and two millions of people are resolved not to pay. The feelings of the Colonies were formerly the feelings of Great Britain. Theirs were formerly the feelings of Mr. Hampden when called upon for the payment of twenty shillings. Would twenty shillings have ruined Mr. Hampden's fortune? No! but the payment of half twenty shillings, on the principle it was demanded, would have made him a slave."

* * * * * *

"Again and again revert to your own principles—seek peace and ensue it—leave America, if she has taxable matter in her, to tax herself. I am not here going into the distinctions of rights, not attempting to mark their boundaries. I do not enter into these metaphysical distinctions; I hate the very sound of them. Leave the Americans as they anciently stood, and these distinctions, born of our unhappy contest, will die along with it. They and we, and they and our ancestors, have been happy under that system. Let the memory of all actions in contradiction to that good old mode, on both sides, be extinguished forever. Be content to bind America by laws of trade; you have always done it. Let this be your reason for binding their trade. Do not burden them by taxes; you were not used to do so from the beginning. Let this be your reason for not taxing. These are the arguments of states and kingdoms. Leave the rest to the schools; for there only they may be discussed with safety."—From a speech on American Taxation, delivered in the House of Commons April 19, 1774.

Horace Walpole said:

"You will not be surprised that I am what I always was, a zealot for liberty in every part of the globe, and consequently that I most heartily wish success to the Americans. They have hitherto not made *one* blunder; and the Administration have made a thousand, besides the two capital ones of first provoking and then of uniting the colonies. The latter seem to have as good heads and hearts as we want both." From a letter to Horace Mann, dated September 7, 1775. "Horace Walpole and His World"—Scribner's—page 152.

In a letter dated February 17, 1779, Horace Walpole says:

"Liberty has still a continent (America) to exist in. I do not care a straw who is minister in this abandoned country. It is the *good old cause of freedom* that I have at heart."

Isaac Barré, Member of Parliament, 1761 to 1790, said, in reply to Lord North's declaration that he would never think of repealing the Tea duty until he saw America prostrate at his feet:

"To effect this is not so easy as some imagine; the Americans are a numerous, a respectable, a hardy, a free people. But were it ever so easy, does any friend to his country really wish to see America thus humbled?

In such a situation, she would serve only as a monument of your arrogance and your folly. For my part, the America I wish to see is America increasing and prosperous, raising her head in graceful dignity, with freedom and firmness asserting her rights at your bar, vindicating her liberties, pleading her services, and conscious of her merit. This is the America that will have spirit to fight your battles, to sustain you when hard pushed by some prevailing foe, and by her industry will be able to consume your manufactures, support your trade, and pour wealth and splendor into your towns and cities. If we do not change our conduct towards her, America will be torn from our side. . . . Unless you repeal this law, you run the risk of losing America."

David Hartley, Member of Parliament for Kingston-upon-Hull, in a speech in the House, May 15, 1777, concluded with these prophetic words :

". . . I will venture to prophesy that the principles of a federal alliance are the only terms of peace that ever will and that ever ought to obtain between the two countries."

On November 2, 1775, Mr. Hartley concluded another speech with these words :

"Let the only contention henceforward between Great Britain and America be, which shall exceed the other in zeal for establishing the fundamental rights of liberty for all mankind."

Jonathan Shipley, Bishop of St. Asaph, in 1774, made a speech intended to have been spoken on the bill for altering the Charters of the Colonies of Massachusetts Bay :

"Let them continue to enjoy the liberty our fathers gave them ! Gave them, did I say? They are co-heirs of liberty with ourselves ; and their portion of the inheritance has been much better looked after than ours. My Lords, I look upon North America as the only great nursery of freemen now left upon the face of the earth. But whatever may be our future fate, the greatest glory that attends this country, a greater than any other nation ever acquired, is to have formed and nursed up to such a state of happiness those colonies whom we are now so eager to butcher."

Both Briton and American being now fully agreed that those who made the attempt to tax without giving the right of representation were wrong, and that in resisting this the colonists vindicated their rights as British citizens and therefore only did their duty, the question arises, Is a separation thus forced upon one of the parties, and now thus deeply regretted by the other, to be permanent ?

I cannot think so, and I crave permission to adduce some considerations in support of my belief that the future is certainly to see a re-union of the separated parts and once again a common citizenship.

First, In race—and there is a great deal in race—the American remains three-fourths purely British. The mixture of the German, which constitutes substantially all of the remainder, though not strictly British, is yet Germanic. The Briton of to-day is himself composed in large measure of the Germanic element, and German, Briton and American are all of the Teutonic race.

The amount of blood other than Anglo-Saxon and Germanic which has entered into the American is almost too trifling to deserve notice, and has been absorbed without changing him in any fundamental trait. The American remains British, differing less from the Briton than the Irishman, Scotsman, Welshman and Englishman differ from each other. Englishmen, Scotsmen, Welshmen and Irishmen are all Britons, and the American (a term which of course includes the Canadian) entering among these would be as near the common type resulting from a union of the five as any of the other parts. Indeed the American in many respects resembles the Scotsman more than the Englishman does, and he also in other respects resembles the Englishman more than does the Scot. He resembles both Englishman and Scot much more than the Irishman resembles either. His introduction into a common British-American citizenship would not produce a resultant differing greatly from that of the present union of Scot, Welshman, Irishman and Englishman. The action of a Congress elected by all these elements would not differ much upon fundamental questions affecting the rights, liberties and privileges of the people, from a Congress of Americans sitting in Washington, or of Canadians in Ottawa or from the action of a British Parliament similarly elected sitting in London. No citizen of any of the present states, either British or American, would have reason to fear the loss of anything which he now holds dear. He could rest securely in the belief that his fellows of the other states could be trusted so to act that the united mass would not oscillate.

A feeling of confidence in each other among the respective communities of the race in Great Britain and America may be expected to grow, as political institutions continue to assimilate.

It is to be noted that only in the region of political ideas is there dissimilarity, for no rupture whatever between the parts has ever taken place in language, literature, religion, or law. In

these uniformity has always existed; although separated politically, the unity of the parts has never been disturbed in these strong cohesive and cementing links. The books and periodicals read upon both sides of the Atlantic are rapidly becoming the same. The decision of one court is good law in all. Language remains uniform, every approved change in one part of the great realm rapidly being adopted throughout the English-speaking world. Religious ideas are the common property of the race. There seems nothing, therefore, to keep the sections of the race apart, but everything to re-unite them.

Second, No one questions that if, instead of eighteen hundred miles of water between America and Britain, there lay another Mississippi Valley, the English-speaking race would be one politically, since the federal system of government has proved that immense areas can be successfully governed under one head, and can exist as one power, the freest government of the parts producing the strongest government of the whole. The difference of land and water lying between people has hitherto been great, and, in the words of the poet, instead of mountains, we can say that

> "Oceans interposed
> Make enemies of nations, who had else,
> Like kindred drops, been mingled into one."

This is quite true of the past; but oceans no longer constitute barriers between nations. These already furnish the cheapest of all modes of communication between men. It has been my good fortune recently to travel from the Pacific Coast to Britain. The journey from San Francisco to New York was made in a moving hotel, in which our party travelled for six weeks and had every want supplied. The time necessary for the trip is five days. The other half of the journey, after a short rest at the Half Way House, New York, was performed in one of the best ocean greyhounds, the time consumed from land to land being only a few hours more than that required for the journey from San Francisco to New York. Over land and over sea we had travelled under the best conditions of to-day. No luxury was wanting. The moving hotel over the land was the best of its kind, as was the moving hotel over the water. The ocean voyage was by far the less fatiguing, and in every respect more comfortable than the overland journey.

The future is, probably, to render travel by sea, if not quite as fast, yet more comfortable to people in general than land travel can possibly be made. The delegate to a conference at Washington, leaving Liverpool or Southampton, now reaches that city in just about the same time as the delegate from San Francisco, Seattle or Victoria on the Pacific Coast. At the time England and Scotland were united, Members of Parliament from the north of Scotland required as long to reach London. A short time ago many of the American Representatives to Congress consumed more time in reaching Washington than either of these. The time required is being lessened every year. The next three months are to see both the ocean and the land journey materially reduced.

Third, The telegraph connecting London, Edinburgh, Dublin, Cardiff, New Orleans, San Francisco, New York, Washington, Montreal, Quebec and Ottawa, bringing all into instantaneous communication, is the most important factor in rendering political reunion possible, and I venture to say inevitable. Without this agency it might well be doubted whether one central authority could act for all the scattered parts, but when events and problems as they arise, and the discussions upon them at the centre, can be instantly known at the extremities, and become everywhere the subject of contemporaneous debate and consideration, thus permitting the centre to influence the extremities and the extremities to respond to the centre, the pulse beat of the entire nation can be constantly felt by the government and all the people. No matter where the capital may be, it must still be omnipresent and in touch with all parts of the confederacy. Time is therefore no longer to be taken into account at all, and distance means but little when all can instantly hear everything that transpires.

Fourth, The advantages of a race confederation are so numerous and so obvious that one scarcely knows how to begin their enumeration. Consider its defensive power. A reunion of the Anglo-Americans, consisting to-day of one hundred and eight millions, which fifty years hence will number more than two hundred millions, would be unassailable upon land by any power or combination of powers that it is possible to create. We need not, therefore, take into account attacks upon the land ; as for the water, the combined fleets would sweep the seas. The new nation would dominate the world and banish from the earth its greatest

stain—the murder of men by men. It would be the arbiter between nations, and enforce the peaceful settlement of all quarrels, saying to any disputants who threatened to draw the sword :

> "Hold! I command you both ;
> The one that stirs makes me his foe.
> Unfold to me the cause of quarrel,
> And I will judge betwixt you."

Such a giant among pigmies as the Re-United States would never need to exert its power, but only to intimate its wishes and decisions. It would be unnecessary for any power to maintain either a great standing army or a great navy. The smaller nations having discovered that they would not be permitted to disturb the peace of the world would naturally disarm. There would be no use in maintaining large forces either for attack or defence when the Anglo-American had determined that no one should attack. I believe that the wisdom of the re-united nation and its regard for others would be so great as to give it such moral ascendency that there would be no disposition upon the part of any power to appeal from its decisions. All would acquire the habit of settling disputes by an appeal to this supreme Tribunal, the friend of all, the enemy of none, without thought of ever going beyond its decrees.

Fifth, There are higher though perhaps not more powerful considerations than the material benefits involved in reunion. Regarding these I should like Britons to consider what the proposed reunion means. Not the most sanguine advocate of "Imperial Federation" dares to intimate that the federation he dreams of would free the markets of all its members to each other. This question cannot even be discussed when Imperial Conferences meet. If it be introduced it is judiciously shelved. But an Anglo-American reunion brings free entry here of all British products as a matter of course. The richest market in the world is opened to Britain free of all duty by a stroke of the pen. No tax can be laid upon products of any part of the Union even for revenue, although under "free trade" such taxes might still exist. What would not trade with the Republic "duty free" mean to the linen, woollen, iron and steel industries of Scotland, to the tin-plate manufacturers of Wales, to the woollen and cotton, coal, iron, cutlery and steel industries of England ? It would mean prosperity to

every industry in the United Kingdom, and this in turn would mean renewed prosperity to the agricultural interest, now so sorely depressed.

Few except those engaged in manufacturing realize the position of Britain as a manufacturer in regard to the American market. The ocean, which many are still apt to consider a barrier between the two countries, is the very agency which brings them so close and will ultimately bind them together. Coal, iron, steel, and all kinds of merchandise from Britain reach American ports more cheaply than American manufactures produced within a hundred miles of these ports. Thus the coal, iron and steel from Glasgow, Hull, Newcastle or Liverpool, reach the cities of New Orleans, Charleston, Savannah, Richmond, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Boston and Portland more cheaply than the same articles mined or manufactured in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Tennessee or Alabama—the land carriage from these States being far greater than the ocean carriage from Great Britain. To the whole Pacific Coast Britain is so much nearer in cost as to give her under reunion the complete command of that market. In the event of reunion the American manufacturers would supply the interior of the country, but the great populations skirting the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific Coast would receive their manufactured articles chiefly from Britain. The heavy products are taken from Britain to the United States in many instances as ballast for nothing. The freight charge is generally trifling. I do not hesitate to say that reunion would bring with it such demand for British products as would tax the present capacity of Britain to the utmost, for the products of Continental nations, which now compete so seriously with Britain, would be almost excluded even by a tariff strictly for revenue. There would not be an idle mine, furnace or factory in the land. The consumption of coal in the United States is already greater than in Britain; of iron and steel it is now fully double. Our consumption of tin plate exceeds that of all the rest of the world. The imports of British textile fabrics grow year after year. These never were so great as at present. The only nation which is taking more and more of British products is the Republic. The American market is enormous and constantly expanding. It is in vain that people in Britain hope for any radical change in the tariff laws. No party in the United States can or will make

many material changes in these. Revenue will continue to be raised by duties upon imports as at present and chiefly upon the fine textile fabrics—the luxuries of the rich. There can be little question that nothing would so certainly insure the permanent prosperity of Britain as free access to the American market, which can be effected so easily through reunion, which would also bring with it enhanced value to land as the result of prosperity in all branches of British trade and industry; and were Britain and America again one the American would find the former the best summer home within his reach. Many would purchase such homes there and secure for themselves the delights of a beneficial change of climate and contact with a thousand sources of sweet influences only to be gained in the old home of the race. The prophecy of the *Spectator* made many years ago and just repeated would be fully realized, that the British American would find the old home his "restful park." It is not going too far to say that every kind of property in the sceptred isle and every business interest would be permanently doubled in value by reunion.

I do not shut my eyes to the fact that reunion, bringing free entrance of British products, would cause serious disturbance to many manufacturing interests near the Atlantic coast, which have been built up under the protective system. But, sensitive as the American is said to be to the influence of the dollar, there is a chord in his nature—the patriotic—which is much more sensitive still. Judging from my knowledge of the American manufacturers there are few who would not gladly make the necessary pecuniary sacrifices to bring about a reunion of the old home and the new. There would be some opposition, of course, from those pecuniarily interested, but this would be silenced by the chorus of approval from the people in general. No private interests, or interests of a class, or of a section of what would then be our common country, would or should be allowed to obstruct a consummation so devoutly to be wished.

If the question be judged in Britain by the material benefits certain to flow from it, never in all her history was such enormous material gain within her reach, and never as much as now has the future position of Britain so urgently required just such an assurance of continued prosperity. The development of manufactures in other lands seriously menaces her future. She has

already lost much in cotton manufacture, which I fear is never to be regained. The product of iron has fallen from nearly nine to less than seven millions of tons. We see decreases written too often in her trade statistics which might be charged to the ebb and flow of industrial affairs, were they not accompanied by startling increases in like branches in competing nations.

Her position is the most artificial of all nations, islands that cannot grow half enough of food to feed her people, but which produce double the amount of manufactured articles they can consume. Such a nation in order to be secure of her future must have a market for these surplus articles and more land from which to draw food for her people. This is precisely what reunion offers—the most valuable and the most rapidly increasing market in the world for her manufactures, and the richest soil for the production of the food she requires. Reunion restores her to ownership in hundreds of millions of acres of fresh, fertile soil, the like of which is elsewhere unknown, reopens a market for her manufactures sufficient even to-day to absorb all her surplus.

Reunion will further benefit the United Kingdom in regard to debt and taxation, potent factors in the industrial race of nations. The national debt per capita of the United States, amounts to $14, that of Britain to $88, that of Canada to $48. The percentage of taxation in the United States, national, state, and local, to earnings was 5.04 last decade; in the United Kingdom, 9.03—nearly double. When the union is restored it will be upon the basis of uniting also the national debts as they stand, and making all a common obligation of the union, so that the United Kingdom would be relieved at once of the greater portion of its national debt, and of at least one-half of all its present heavy taxation, even if no reduction of expenditure resulted from having one general government, one army and navy instead of two. About one-fourth of all national taxation in recent years in the Republic has gone in payment of debt, and a much greater proportion recently for pensions, which are temporary, so that the current expenses of the general government will after a time not require more than one-half the present amount of taxation.

The only course for Britain seems to be reunion with her giant child, or sure decline to a secondary place, and then to comparative insignificance in the future annals of the English-speaking race,

which is to increase so rapidly in America. Heaven forbid that she who has been and yet is so great, and still so deeply reverenced, should unwisely choose continued separation and tread a by-path apart leading to an inglorious career. Let her statesmen study the situation, therefore, and learn that reunion with her American children is the only sure way to prevent continued decline. Re-united with these, Britain takes a new lease of prosperity; decline is arrested and increase begins.

Sixth, The influence upon the individual citizen of power in the state and especially of power used for great and good ends is immeasurable. The conquering Briton has conquered more and more easily as he has had behind him more and more of a record of achievements of his race. "I am a Roman citizen" was a boast which made him who uttered it not only a greater Roman but a greater man. To develop heroes there must be occasions for heroism. To develop statesmen the state must have a great part to play in the world. Had the Republic remained a mere colony it would never have discovered its Franklin, Adams, Hamilton, and Hancock, and what would the world have known of Washington; what part could he have ever played to make him Washington? What would the world have known of that genius Lincoln, the greatest statesman of the century, or of many centuries, had he not been called upon to preserve the Republic, and with a stroke of the pen to make four million slaves freemen? In like manner Hampden, Pym, Elliott and Cromwell would have remained comparatively obscure men but for the part which it was possible for them to play upon so large a stage as Britain. What the British boy grows to be as a citizen largely depends upon how he is fashioned by knowing and dwelling upon the history of his country's triumphs and of its leaders in the past. What would the American boy become as a citizen if he had not his Washington and other revolutionary heroes to inspire him, and cause the blood to tingle in his veins as he reads the story of his country's struggle for independence? What kind of a man would the Scotsman be if bereft of the glorious history of his country and its sacrifices for the cause of civil and religious liberty? He is fed upon and becomes part of Wallace, Knox and Burns. Every state should aim to be great and powerful, and noble in the exercise of its power, because power in the state, nobly exercised, is the strongest influence in producing good and

patriotic citizens. Every citizen, being a constituent part of the state under democracy, partakes in some measure of its greatness. A small and petty political unity tends to breed small and petty men of all classes ; dealing with great affairs broadens and elevates the character. All these and many other considerations plead for reunion.

Let us now consider the position and feelings of the various parts of the English-speaking world towards reunion, beginning with Canada. Canada would undoubtedly favor reunion. She would gladly reënter a race-federation of which Britain and the United States were again the other members. Therefore, it can be said of her : "She is ready."

Touching the United States, we find the American Union constantly adding States. The original thirteen have now swollen to forty-four. Other States, now in process of formation, will soon raise the number to fifty. So quietly are these admissions made that the Nation is scarcely aware of them. A convention of the people of a Territory decides to ask admission to the Union as a State ; Congress passes a bill of a few lines, which the President signs, admitting the new member. Elections are held in the new State for Governor, members of a State Legislature and officers of the State, and also for Representatives and Senators. The latter make their appearance in Washington, present their credentials, take the oath and their seat in the National Councils. There is nothing more to be done. The State attends to all its internal affairs and the General Government attends to all general matters. The American people are favorable to the extension of national boundaries. No evil, but great good, has come from every succeeding addition to their union. Therefore, a proposition to re-unite Britain and the Republic would not seem anything novel to them. They are used to territorial extension.

The reunion idea would be hailed with enthusiasm. No idea yet promulgated since the formation of union would create such unalloyed satisfaction. It would sweep the country. No party would oppose, each would try to excel the other in approval. Therefore, as of Canada, so of the Republic we can say : "She is ready."

Here we have two members out of the three secured. As far as these are concerned the question might be raised to-morrow. It is only when we approach the Old Home that we are compelled

to recognize that it is not yet ripe for reunion. But this cannot even be said of all of its members. In one of the islands a proposal to become part of the great British-American Nation would be hailed with delight. We can safely say of Ireland: "She is ready."

The position of Scotland in the United Kingdom is that of a small state overshadowed by a great one. She is dissatisfied, and is to-day demanding power to govern herself after her own ideas. Her position as a State among the proposed States of the great Re-Union would be more desirable and infinitely more exalted and more independent in every respect than her present position as a State in the small Union of England, Ireland and Wales. And not one particle would she be less distinctively Scotland, than she is Scotland to-day. Indeed, she would be more Scotland than she is now Scotland, because the rights which a State in the Re-Union would hold are the rights of sovereignty. She would be supreme within her borders, with a National Parliament, and full control over her land, her Church, her education, and all her national institutions. She would only surrender to a General Parliament control of certain stated affairs of an international character. After a short campaign of explanation throughout my native land, I am confident we should be able to say of Scotland: "She is ready;" and what Scotland requires is all that Wales requires, when of her we could also say: "She is ready." Her status would also be raised, not depressed, by reëntering the Greater Union. Scotland would be more Scotland, Ireland more Ireland, Wales more Wales, than they are at present. What great difference would it make to Wales, Ireland and Scotland if their representatives to the Supreme Council should proceed to Washington instead of to London? Yet this is all the change that would be required, and for this they would have insured to them all the rights of independent States, and free access to the only market which can make and keep them prosperous.

The sole remaining member is England, and we confess that much has to be accomplished in the way of change before she can be induced to again accept the headship of the race as the oldest and most revered member in a great reunion which, however, she could not expect to dominate as she now dominates the present union of the three small states, containing less than one-third of her own population, which constitute with her the

United Kingdom. But the Greater Union would be one in which although she could not be all-powerful, yet she would undoubtedly be first, and regarded with all the deference due to age and motherhood.

At first glance, the Briton who considers this question may feel that the proposed reunion would involve the giving up of his separate nationality, with its unequalled history, its triumphs and all that makes the sceptred isle the object of his love and admiration. There is nothing whatever in this. Not a line of the long scroll would be dimmed, not a word erased. The past cannot be obscured, and the future, under the proposed reunion with the other branches of her own race, may be trusted to be grander than the past, as the power and career of the re-united nation must be greater than that of any of its branches. Officials may be expected to denounce the idea of reunion, fearing that their positions under the new régime would be, not less dignified, but less likely to be theirs. But the people of Britain have no cause to fear that anything would be taken from them, and every reason to see that much would be added. We observe in the history of the world that patriotism is ever expansive. Centuries ago the people of Perugia and Assisi, fifteen miles apart, were deadly enemies, attacked each other and played at making war and treaties. Even St. Francis was wounded in one of these campaigns. The patriotism of the Perugian and the Assisian could not embrace an area so great as fifteen miles. To-day patriotism stretches over hundreds of miles, in some cases thousands of miles, and does not lose but gain in intensity as it covers a wider area. There is more to be patriotic about. The patriotism of to-day which melts when pushed beyond the shores of the island of Britain, may safely be trusted to partake in the near future of the expansive quality. It will soon grow and cover the doings of the race wherever situated, beyond the bounds of the old home. Professor Freeman, under the influence of this wider and nobler patriotism, has already been compelled to declare :

"He is no Englishman at heart, he has no true feeling of the abiding tie of kindred, who deems that the glory and greatness of the child (Republic) is other than part of the glory and greatness of the parent."

National patriotism or pride cannot, therefore, prove a serious obstacle in the way of reunion.

It is to be carefully pondered that had separation never occurred it would long since have been necessary for the larger part of the population to be represented in the General Parliament. It is not conceivable that seventy millions of citizens upon one side of the Atlantic would consent to be governed by thirty-eight on the other. If they were so, they would prove themselves most undesirable members of any union. Free born Britons should have no union with such people. It is because they are British and masterful and will have equality with other Britons that it is desirable or even safe to unite with them. Long ere this, therefore, the representatives of seventy millions would be greater in number than the representatives of thirty-eight millions; and consequently the condition of England or even Britain in this Greater Britain could not have been that of one member overshadowing all the rest. When reunion takes place no one state can have such power. England would be more powerful than any six of the numerous states; but she would not be more powerful than all combined. Nor is it desirable that any one member should be so. If Britain were to stand for this it would be equivalent to saying that even if the American colonies had not seceded she herself would have seceded from them under the policy of rule or ruin and of refusal to consider her fellow citizens as political equals.

Numerous as would be the states comprising the re-united nation, each possessing equal rights, still Britain, as the home of the race, would ever retain precedence—first among equals. However great the number of the children who might sit around her in council, there could never be but one mother, and that mother, Britain.

To resolve to enter no federation of the race in which Britain's vote would not outweigh all the others combined would be to assign to Britain a petty future indeed, since the race cannot increase much in the United Kingdom and is certain to be soon numbered by hundreds of millions in America. "Think what we lost when we lost you," said a Briton recently to an American. "Ah," replied the American, "but just think what we lost." "What did you lose?" "Britain," was the reply. This was true; the loss was mutual—as the gain from reunion will be mutual. Each in losing itself will regain the other.

The impediments to reunion may here be mentioned and considered:

First among these the great colonial empire, upon which Britain justly dwells with pride. The colonial, however, is a mere temporary stage in the development of nations. All colonies which prosper and grow ultimately develop into independent states. These always have done so, and they always will. It is certain that Australasia will have a new confederation if she fulfils the expectations of many as to her future growth. If, however, she does not increase in the future faster than she has been doing for some time, she will no doubt long remain as at present under the protectorate of the old land. There would be no objection to her remaining under the protection of the reunion. The numerous small settlements and dependencies could in like manner also remain. There is, therefore, no valid obstacle in the colonial feature.

India, with its grave responsibilities, remains. No branch of the race now clear of any share in these would willingly consent to become a partner in them. India, called the "Brightest Jewel in the Crown," may be "red" again some day. My experience in India, travelling as an American, gave me an insight into the forces and aspirations of its people which the citizen of the conquering nation is never permitted to obtain. The wisest and most cautious statesmanship alone can lead in peace the two hundred and eighty millions of India to self-government; and much has been done by the education of the people to render the bestowal of self-government upon them inevitable. British occupation of that vast country is necessarily temporary. Britain will ere long be relieved from its dangerous position there. The right of self-government will be granted to the people, who will be ready upon short notice to establish themselves as an independent power. There is really no longer any decided advantage to the parent land in colonies, or in dependencies like India, since there has been conferred upon these freedom of trade with all nations and the right to tax imports, even from the parent land. Britain retains the trade of these regions because she can best supply their wants and this she could do just as completely were they independent. Trade pays no attention to flags; it follows the lowest price current. India, therefore, can soon be placed upon the road to independence and the British-American Union would guide it to this as well as the present Union of the United Kingdom.

The position of Britain in regard to European questions, which might alarm America, is rapidly changing. The doctrine of non-intervention is strong enough, even to-day, to give her practical immunity from participation in European wars. Were Britain part of the Re-United States all that she would be interested about in Enrope would be fully secured ; namely, the protection of her own soil and the command of the seas. No balance of power, no occupation of Egypt, or any similar question would be of the slightest importance. The re-united nation would be prompt to repel any assault upon the soil or the rights of any of its parts.

The monarchical form of government is admittedly a cause of disunion, but this form is not *eterne*. Scarcely a session of Parliament passes which does not in some department bring about an assimilation of political institutions to those of Canada and the United States. It is recognized by all that Britain is no longer a government of the few, but has really become in substance a democracy. A House of hereditary Legislators is of all present institutions probably destined to have the shortest life in Britain. The House of Lords is not effective as a legislative chamber, even to-day. With its abolition or reform the question of maintaining an hereditary head of the state will follow. The opinion is often expressed in Britain that the Prince of Wales is probably to be the last official sitting by hereditary right. It is said that this opinion has been expressed by the Prince himself. From what wise friends who know the Prince tell me, I am persuaded that he is the last man in the world to stand in the way of healing a separation which he so constantly deplores, and unless the estimate formed by all, of the patriotism, virtues and character of Her Majesty herself be strangely awry, she would give up much beyond her crown to be the peacemaker who brought reunion to her race. Strange almost beyond explanation is the fact that this woman, from one point of view bereft of political power, a mere instrument in the hands of her elected ministers, nevertheless is in this omnipotent. She is the only one who could by a sublime act reunite the separated branches of her race. Never in the history of the world has it been in the power of any human being to perform so great an act, or to secure so commanding a place among "the immortal few who were not born to die." All the saints in the calendar would give place to Saint Victoria were Providence

to favor her by calling her to perform a mission so fraught with blessing to her people and to the world. There would be but two names set apart forever in the annals of the English-speaking race—names farther beyond all other names than any name now known to man is beyond that of all his fellows—Victoria and Washington—patron saints of our race; he the conqueror, who manlike drew the sword in righteous quarrel; she, womanlike, the angel of peace and reconciliation; each adding lustre to the other and equal in power and glory.

For such a mission and such a destiny even Queen Victoria on bended knee might pray.

In England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales a proposition to make all officials elective by the people after Victoria passes away, which God grant must be long is the prayer of every American, would command a heavy vote. It is thought by many that the majority would be great indeed in all the members of the United Kingdom for the abolition of hereditary legislators. Before the question of reunion is ripe for settlement in England there will remain no trace of hereditary privilege. As the *Scotsman* some years ago so well said: "Democracy means, and rightly means, that privilege shall cease."

There remains the question of the Established Church, which at present would create an insuperable obstacle to reunion; but it has already been abolished in one of the members of the United Kingdom, and is about to be abolished in another; and it is only a question of a few years ere it be also abolished in Scotland.

This leaves us again with only England as the obstructive member to reunion; but as with the House of Lords, the Colonial system, and the Monarchy, so with the Established Church, even in England. What has been adopted in three members of the United Kingdom will finally be adopted in the fourth. The tendency of the age is fatal to making any sect the favorite of the state. Equal protection to all, favor to none, is the doctrine in regard to religious bodies. The question of an Established Church in the one member, England, therefore, will not exist to prevent reunion.

We might from one point of view consider the idea of "Imperial Federation" an obstacle to reunion, but it is really a help, for the discussion of that question can only pave the way for the acceptance of the only desirable federation. It needs only to be

pointed out to Britain that, granted Imperial Federation acquired, she would obtain little or no extension of markets and could then only hope to be a member of a union which comprised a very small portion of the race. The growth of the English-speaking race during the last ten years is ominous when considered in its bearing upon the Imperial Federation idea. In 1880 a federation of England and her colonies would have contained 42,308,843 people. The population of the Republic at that time was 50,155,783. Contrast now these figures with those of 1890. Imperial Federa- would have embraced in 1890, 46,437,974. The population of the Republic was then 62,622,250. Thus in ten short years the American Republic has added twelve and a half millions to its population; the members of the proposed "Imperial Federation" only four and a quarter millions. The United Kingdom increased only 2,638,000, Canada only 508,000, Australasia—Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales, New Zealand, Tasmania, etc.—combined, only 1,024,193, sundry small settlements the remainder.

Let it be assumed that the two branches increase in the same proportion as for the last ten years, and

1900 will show :—	Imperial Federation	50,600,000
	The Republic	78,100,000
1910 will show :—	Imperial Federation	55,600,000
	The Republic	97,600,000
1920 will show :—	Imperial Federation	61,100,009
	The Republic	122,000,000
1930 will show :—	Imperial Federation	67,200,000
	The Republic	152,500,000
1940 will show :—	Imperial Federation	73,900,000
	The Republic	190,600,000

This will be the result only fifty years hence, when men now in manhood will still be living.

If the estimate be carried forward for fifty years more, making the complete century, the figures will stand :

Imperial Federation	119,000,000
The Republic	581,000,000

We have considered here the two parts—Republic and Empire—as two solid bodies, the increase of the Republic, 1880 to 1890, having been 24.87 per cent., the Empire's average increase, 10 per cent.; the United Kingdom's increase—8.17—has been of course less than the average, Canada's increase, 11 per cent., just one per cent. above the average, and Australasia's percentage of increase much higher, 39 per cent. It is not probable that any of the parts in either Empire or Republic will maintain the past rate of increase; especially is it considered improbable by

experts that the United Kingdom can increase much, since other countries are becoming better able to supply their own wants. Australasia has only added one million in ten years, and this chiefly in the first years of the decade. Her future, as the home of a great population, is not yet considered quite clear. Canada, under present conditions, is not likely to do more than maintain her slow rate of increase. The Republic seems likely to more nearly keep up its present rate of increase than the others, so that it is quite safe to assume that at least the relative difference between Imperial Federation and the United States, here indicated, will be maintained.

If Britain, America and Canada were to re-unite to-day, the population of the Reunion would be one hundred and eight millions. All the other parts of the English-speaking race would not number five millions. It is into such a complete race reunion of her people that the door is now wide open for the parent land to enter and take first place—first among equals. In view of this high destiny, hers for the asking, who is he among her citizens who can sit down and deliberately plan for his country such a future as these figures prove would be hers under Imperial Federation. I cannot understand how any true Briton can so far forget what is due to the mother land. No patriot surely can or will longer connect himself with a movement which has for its aim so miserable an end. If the Imperial Federationist be willing to unite with a few millions of people at the antipodes, who will not even entertain the idea of imports under free trade, much less "duty free," what objection can he raise to reunion with the main body of our race, only five days' sail from his shores, who offer not free trade only, which allows taxes upon imports for revenue, but entrance of everything duty free. I confidently appeal to the sterling patriotism which animates the Imperial Federationists and inspires them with ardent wishes for the future of their land to discard the narrow idea which tends to defeat their dearest hope. I beseech them to come with us who seek the reunion of all.

In the affairs of nations as well as in those of individuals there is a tide which not taken at the flood swings the ship of state from the main channel into the shoals and eddies where future progress is impossible.

It may confidently be expected there will arise in Britain a strong public sentiment protesting against the effort of some to

relegate her to a subordinate rôle through an Imperial Federation which fails to federate the mass of the race.

From a review of the present position of the question we find that even to-day we can say Canada, the United States and Ireland are ready for reunion; that Scotland presents no great difficulty; neither does Wales, and both have everything to gain and nothing to lose by reunion; and that the causes of continued disunion which admittedly exist in England are rapidly vanishing and are all melting away like snow in the sunshine; the colonial empire, the Indian question, European entanglements present no insuperable obstacle, and hereditary privilege and a national church are doomed. The present generation is to find several of these obstructions abolished; the succeeding generation probably is to find no trace of any of them.

Let no man imagine that I write as a partisan in dealing with these questions. I know no party in this great argument either in America or in Britain. Whatever obstructs reunion I oppose, whatever promotes reunion I favor. I judge all political questions from this standpoint. All party divisions sink into nothingness in my thoughts compared with the reunion of our race.

The ground thus cleared in the only member in which it is now cumbered, there is presented to us the spectacle of three branches of the race, Britain, Canada, and America, formerly united and now enjoying similar institutions but remaining disunited. We seek in vain for any reason why the old quarrel should not be healed, why those separated by a difference which no longer exists should not let the dead past bury its dead, and once more unite as parts of one great whole, just as the two parts of the Republic, plunged into civil war by the question of slavery, have again united in bonds more loving and more enduring than ever; just as Scotland and England, after long wars and separate existence, have been united, to the incalculable advantage of both; just as the Provinces of Canada have united all the three branches in one Dominion, having had in their own histories experience of the evils and cost of separation and likewise of the advantages flowing from union. That each should now consider a reunion on a greater scale, and yet only a repetition of what each has already made upon a smaller scale, seems the most natural thing in the world. The residents of any member of the reunited nation will be nearer in time to the common centre than the residents of the

north of Scotland were to London at the time of the union; nearer than the residents of the extremities of the Republic were to Philadelphia when the Federal Union was formed. And in addition to this the citizen in any part of the new federation, by means of the telegraph, really will sit within the precincts of the Capitol; almost, it might be said, within hearing of the proceedings of the national councils. Properly viewed, the reunion of the Briton, American and Canadian will be less of a step forward than was the union of Scotland and England, the union of the Provinces of Canada, or the American Union, the parts to be reunited by such a federation being in every true sense nearer together, and the new empire more compact, than were the parts of either of these three unions at the date of their origin.

The means by which reunion is to be accomplished are ready to hand. There is sitting at this moment in Paris a conference composed of delegates from London, Ottawa, and Washington charged by the three branches of our race to obtain a satisfactory basis for the preservation of the seals in Behring Sea. After their task has been concluded the same distinguished men, each among the foremost citizens of the respective branches, could meet in London and suggest a basis for restoring the union which only a century ago so happily existed between Britain, Canada and America and made them one nation. It would be so easy a task that its very simplicity amazes and renders us incredulous, but most of the important successes and most valuable discoveries have been remarkable for this very feature.

As easy as Le Cling's setting types, as easy as Franklin's drawing the lightning down, as Newton's divining the meaning of a falling apple, or Galileo of a swinging lamp, or Watts the raising of a kettle lid by the force of the escaping steam, as Spencer's survival of the fittest, as Darwin's origin of species, as Columbus sailing westward, or the making of the American Constitution—the Gordian knot is always easily cut, so easily that the only wonder is that it was not done before. Nothing mysterious, elaborate or difficult reaches to the root and changes the face of the world, or the trend of events. The road always lies broad, open, straight, obvious to all transcendent successes; there is no hidden, tortuous and narrow path to anything truly great. Some day, therefore, delegates from the three now separated branches will meet in London and readily agree upon and report for

approval and ratification a basis for the restoration of an indissoluble union of indestructible states.

This may all seem Utopian, but we have had many prophetic voices, concerning both Britain and America, more than fulfilled, which were at the time of their inspired utterance much wilder than anything herein suggested. It may be all a dream and I but a mere dreamer of dreams. So be it. But if it be true that he who always dreams accomplishes nothing, so also is it none the less true that he who never dreams is equally barren of achievement. And if it be a dream, it is a dream nobler than most realities. If it is never to be realized, none the less it should be realized, and shame to those who come after us if it be not. I believe it will be, for all progress is upon its side. All that tends to the brotherhood of man tends to promote it. The tendency of the age is towards consolidation. We have behind us and with us, urging its consummation, all the mighty forces of civilization. The Parliament of Man and the Federation of the World have already been hailed by the poet, and these mean a step much farther in advance of the proposed reunion of Britain and America than that reunion is in advance of the Canadian Confederation, of the American Union, or of the Union of England and Scotland, all already accomplished.

Readers will kindly note that this is A Look Ahead—how far ahead I shall not attempt to guess—nevertheless *it is ahead,* and sometime, somehow, it is to come to pass. I see it with the eye of faith, the faith of the devotee which carries with it a realizing sense of certain fulfilment.

Time may dispel many pleasing illusions and destroy many noble dreams, but it shall never shake my belief that the wound caused by the wholly unlooked for and undesired separation of the mother from her child is not to bleed forever.

Let men say what they will, therefore, I say that as surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again "The Re-united States," "The British-American Union."

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

POLICE PROTECTION AT THE WORLD'S FAIR.

BY R. W. M'CLAUGHRY, GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT CHICAGO POLICE, AND BY JOHN BONFIELD, CHIEF SECRET SERVICE WORLD'S COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION.

I.

It is of the greatest importance that the people who propose to visit Chicago to see the World's Columbian Exposition shall feel that they will be reasonably protected, as to their persons and property, during their sojourn in the city. For this reason, a brief statement of the preparations made, to that end, by the municipal government of Chicago will be of interest at this time.

The administration that has just closed kept steadily in view the necessity of ample preparation for the work that will be expected of the different departments of the city during the next six months, and shaped its policy accordingly. The new administration has been organized with the purpose of giving to Chicago a government that shall be most helpful to the success of the great Exposition, as well as to the comfort and happiness of all who visit it.

The police force of Chicago has certainly proved itself worthy to be considered a good one. It has, up to this time, been equal to all the emergencies that have arisen. It handled the vast crowds upon our streets and in the Fair grounds during the dedication of the Exposition buildings with care, humanity and good judgment, winning the praise of citizens from all parts of the country as well as the commendation of the people of Chicago. The criminal classes were looked after closely, and very few complaints of robberies were made. Noted thieves who came, expecting to reap a rich harvest during Dedication week, found themselves at once recognized and in immediate receipt of marked attention from the police authorities. The result was that most of them left town without waiting for the dedication services.

With the beginning of the present year the City Council provided for a large increase of the police force. Our detective force has also been largely recruited from the most experienced men in other cities, both in this country and abroad, and arrangements have been completed so that the force, thus equipped, will work in entire harmony with the large and well-selected body of special detectives that has been organized under the auspices of the Exposition authorities, for duty in and about the Fair grounds.

The city has been carefully districted throughout, and the uniformed as well as the secret service force so distributed as to secure prompt and effective service in every quarter. The men have been thoroughly drilled. Schools of instruction for officers and patrolmen have been maintained in all the stations. Special efforts have been made throughout the past year to rid the force of unworthy and useless members. The new recruits have been mustered in only after rigid examination and careful inspection. They thoroughly understand that they can keep their places only by merit.

Some three years ago the department adopted the system of anthropometric identification and classification of criminals, invented by M. Alphonse Bertillon, of Paris, and established for the city a bureau of identification. This bureau has, within the past year, been greatly enlarged and improved. It now contains photographs, measurements, and otherwise accurate descriptions of many thousands of the most noted living criminals of the United States and other countries. By a wonderful system of classification these descriptions are so arranged as to be available in a moment, thus enabling the operator to turn at once to the record of the criminal whose measurement he is taking, if he has ever before been recorded in the collection, and confront him with his complete identification. From the principal prisons of the country, from the collections in every large city of the United States, Canada, and Mexico, and from foreign cities, these records have been diligently collected for many months past by an agent of the Police Department, until nearly every known criminal who is likely to visit Chicago during the World's Fair is "on record," and will find himself "registered" before selecting his hotel.

It is confidently expected that the policy of the police magistrates will be shaped to afford the greatest assistance possible, consistent with the law, to the Police Department; that offenders

will be dealt with promptly; that the "law's delay," which is so often invoked to defeat justice, will be greatly abridged if not totally abolished; that those who come to prey upon the community during the Fair will find their contest with the civil authorities "short, sharp and decisive," resulting in their enforced seclusion during the entire period of the Fair.

It would not, perhaps, be wise to give, in detail, a statement of all that has been done by the police and other municipal authorities to meet the responsibilities and emergencies of the next six months, but it may be stated, with entire confidence, that ample preparation has been made, in every direction, for such protection of our guests as will warrant them in entering our gates without apprehension, and will cause them to depart with reluctance and with praises on their lips, not only for the management of the great Exposition but for the municipal government of the "Garden City."

R. W. McClaughry.

II.

Police protection, like any other form of safeguard for persons and property, is more effectively rendered in forestalling crime than in remedying evils that have been incurred. The organization of the whole system of fire, police and secret service within the Exposition grounds has been based on the knowledge that its greatest value lies in the prevention of crime, the prevention of fires, and the detection of criminals before they can commit crime. The subject under consideration is limited to the secret-service branch of the organization—a branch designed to prevent professional and amateur criminals from following their trade within the gates. Naturally, too, it is intended to work in the most harmonious way with the Chicago department of police under General Superintendent McClaughry, on lines that will be described later.

The Exposition secret service is a branch of the physical force of the Fair, under the Department of Works, deriving its authority from the State, operating on park territory and still within the jurisdiction, to a degree, of the city police authority. The preliminary study of the subject made by the Chief of the

Secret Service soon after his appointment showed that the department would necessarily have to be organized on the very broadest plans, because the size of the crowd expected, and the temporary influx of strangers from every quarter of the globe, presented a problem of international significance. The experience of the authorities at every universal exhibition showed that such affairs invariably attract an international gathering of the dangerous classes of society. Naturally, the greatest proportion of these undesirable visitors is to be expected from the cities of the United States; and the problem resolved itself into the detection and arrest of depredators from the cities of this country having a census population of 25,000 or more, and the immediate arrest of the same class of visitors from the great cities of Europe.

Considering the situation in its varied aspects, the department issued a circular letter to the police authorities in the cities of this country and Europe, asking them to detail two men from each city to serve under the department during the Exposition period, the salaries of the men to be continued by their home departments, and their transportation and an allowance for expenses to be paid by the Exposition during the term of service. The invitation was also extended to the management of the great penal institutions of this country.

In almost every case the letter met with immediate and prompt response. It was obvious to those addressed that such an opportunity for the study of criminals and methods of detection would be of the greatest possible value to the men detailed for the special service, and the opportunity was of exceptional value because it meant the comparison of methods in use in all the great cities of this country and Europe. In response to the invitation some six hundred men and more have reported for duty, and have been organized under the proper officers.

The plan of operation is much the same as in regular city service, except that the small area to be covered, and the comparatively limited opportunity for escape, gives the department every advantage in its dealings with thieves, pickpockets and their confreres. The park is subdivided into six districts. Each district is provided with its own station, and a telephone connecting it with the central station at the Chief's headquarters. The men are assigned to duty in pairs, care being taken to arrange the de-

tails so that no two men from the same geographical section shall travel together. For instance, the officer from San Francisco is paired with one from London, Paris, New York, or some other large Eastern city of this country. The object of this arrangement is two-fold : it doubles the detective capacity of the men, and at the same time gives them the advantage of a study of each other's methods. The San Francisco officer points out the criminals from his section of the country, and the London officer in turn is ready to receive criminals from home, and see to it that his occidental companion knows them well enough to remember them when he sees them again. To extend the operation of the general scheme still further, the details are shifted every month or oftener if need be, so that when the whole term of service is over the different members of the force will have had the acquaintance of officers from all over the immense territory represented in the department, with the attendant knowledge of criminals who come within the gates.

These are the details of the organization so far as they may be announced without affecting the efficiency of the service. If a criminal happens to enter the gates of the Exposition he will find the odds very much against the successful pursuit of his calling. Officers detailed for the purpose will be stationed at every gate and entrance in citizen's clothes, to report such arrivals. If by any chance the unwelcome visitor passes the gate without detection, he is apt to meet an officer from his own home at any point within the grounds. And if, in spite of these chances against him, he picks a pocket, or attempts to steal anything, an alarm will find the gates at every point of exit furnished with a description of the offender. Such an alarm, with the compact territory to be guarded, practically shuts the criminal within a trap where nothing but the most remarkable good luck on his part can save him from detection, arrest and punishment. What makes the malefactor's operations more difficult and more certain of detection is the fact that nowhere within the gates can he find a place in which he can disguise himself without arousing suspicion and multiplying his chances of arrest.

When a suspicious character is arrested he will receive the hospitality of the city, and the benefit of the Bertillon system of identification mentioned in Superintendent McClaughry's article on the city's arrangements. Under that system he has very little

chance of escaping identification if he is an old offender, and if he is a new hand in crime he will be recorded, so that his future scope of operations will necessarily be limited. It is the intention of the Exposition secret service to coöperate with the city authorities so actively that any subject of arrest will be handed over to them, for punishment if proved guilty, and for warning and probable expulsion when conviction is impossible, if the records show the prisoner to be of the habitual criminal class.

Given such a disadvantage as outlined, given the wide-reaching acquaintance possessed by the department collectively, and it seems scarcely probable that any large number of criminals will venture to expose themselves to the almost certain punishment or expulsion that awaits their appearance. In an experience that covers a considerable knowledge of criminals and their habits, I have never known them to venture into surroundings where the risks were so disproportionately large as compared with the gains offered in case of success. The expert thief or pickpocket, confidence man, or his associates, has as keen a sense of proportion as the broker or banker. His calculations are always based on the ratio between the possible gain and probable loss. Taking this into consideration, I feel safe in predicting a comparatively small attendance of the dangerous classes, and a large percentage of detections among those who do attend. If the question is put point blank, as to the protection offered the visitors from without the city of Chicago, the answer may be made without hesitation that the persons and property of strangers will be as safe during the extraordinary crowds of the summer as they are in ordinary times. The conditions will be unusual, of course, but the precautions are also so unusual as to guarantee more than average protection to the guests of the city and the Exposition.

JOHN BONFIELD.

THIRTY KNOTS AN HOUR TO EUROPE.

POSSIBILITIES OF SPEED ON THE ATLANTIC.

BY J. H. BILES, PROFESSOR OF NAVAL ARCHITECTURE, UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW, AND DESIGNER OF THE "PARIS" AND THE "NEW YORK."

THE speed of Atlantic steamships has become a subject of national interest to Americans, for a majority of the cabin passengers carried belong to the United States. But until a few weeks ago, when the "Paris" and "New York" were transferred to the new American Line from the old Inman Line, there was not a vessel in the trade flying the American flag or representing, except to a very small extent, American capital. It is now no secret that these two vessels were projected and owned by Americans and would have carried the American flag from the time they were launched had the laws of the United States been the same in relation to ships as they are in Great Britain. Recent legislation in the States has now, however, made it possible for the owners of the "New York" and the "Paris" to construct a fleet of similar vessels in America which shall have a reasonable prospect of giving a proper profit to their owners, and shall make possible a bi-weekly service of steamers to Europe, by means of which Americans shall be enabled to travel in American-built and American-owned ships at as high a speed as engineering science can give, consistently with the condition of securing a fair interest upon the money invested in such ships.

To decide what that speed shall be is the problem which must be attempted by those who are responsible for insuring a proper profit upon the money spent. Given, that a certain average number of passengers, paying an average rate of so many dollars, will present themselves to be carried, and that a certain number of tons of freight will be forthcoming, which will add a cer-

tain amount to the earnings of the shipowner, it is then within the power of the manager of such a line of steamers to say how much he can spare, from the money so received, to pay for means of propulsion, insurance, depreciation, repairs, and interest on first cost. From such figures he could readily determine the speed, beyond which the interest would not be earned. But no one can say with any degree of accuracy how many passengers will travel if ships are run at speeds much in excess of present ones, or how much the existence of a regular bi-weekly service of high-speed ships would develop traffic which at present does not exist. So the questions of speed and volume of trade react upon each other in a way which it is difficult to foresee.

The attempt to attain increased speed must therefore be looked upon commercially as being more or less of an experiment. The increased cost of producing the increased speed can only lead to a commercial success if that increased speed is accompanied by an increase in the volume of trade. This increased volume of trade must be of advantage to the country whose flag the ship flies, as well as to the shipowner whose enterprise has produced the ship. The shipowner cannot tell whether his ships will pay until they have actually been at work for some time, and have really developed the increased traffic, so that he, unaided, practically takes all the risk. If, however, the people or their representatives take a wide enough view of this question, they may assist the shipowner by subsidy to enable him to minimize the risk of commercial failure. If the traffic develops sufficiently to insure commercial success, the country will probably have gained much more than it has paid for, and will be in a condition to continue the assistance to the shipowner, provided that he continues to take such steps as shall insure from time to time a continued increase of speed.

Thus, the first element of increased speed is the reduction of the risk of commercial failure. Government subvention, judiciously given, seems to be the most certain way, and will be in the end the cheapest way for a country to obtain increased speed in its cross-sea means of transportation. For many classes of freight, and probably for some classes of passengers, the increase of speed would not be accompanied by an increase in the volume of trade. With such complete telegraphic communication as now exists, rapid transit of freight of many kinds is of small import-

ance. The volume of these goods coming into a country may be carried by a small number of ships moving at a high rate of speed, or by a larger number moving at a slower rate. The question of the cheapest method of moving these goods is of more importance than the speed at which they are moved. It is very much like the flow in a pipe of water to a city. It may be done by means of a small pipe, the velocity of the water being great, and the loss of energy by the friction of the water in the pipe being also great. Or it may be done by means of a large pipe, the water moving in it slowly. In the latter case the loss will be less, but the first cost of the pipe will be more, and only the experienced engineer can tell just at what point the advantage of increased size of pipe and reduced speed balances the disadvantage of increased first cost. So it is in freight such as grain, coal, cotton, etc., where the total volume delivered into a country is all that the receivers are interested in. The question of the size of ship, the number and speed of the ships, is one that depends upon the relation of what may be called loss by friction in running (in other words, the expense of getting the freight through the water) to the first cost of the machine necessary to do the work.

This problem is modified to some extent by the distance which the cargo has to be transported. Some of the weight carried is necessarily the fuel to propel the ship and cargo. Hence the cargo delivered is really the weight put on board, less the amount of coal consumed on the way. When the distance is short and the speed not great, the amount of coal burnt is small, and the net cargo delivered is not much reduced. If the cargo be carried at a high speed, the amount of coal burnt on the way is naturally much more than at a low speed. But if the distance be short the total deduction of cargo-carrying is not large whether the speed be high or low, and consequently for short distances the loss of cargo-carrying due to high speed is not great. The number of voyages is increased with the higher speed, and the amount of cargo delivered per year is thereby correspondingly increased. Hence for short distances and a given size of ship, cargo can be carried at a higher speed than it can for longer distances, with the same commercial efficiency.

If for cargo we substitute all the part of a ship which goes to make up passenger convenience, comfort and accommodation, the same proposition will hold good. All these things mean weight,

and though they are not removable, as cargo is, they can be treated for sea-going purposes in exactly the same way.

Hence, one of the possibilities of increased speed lies in reducing the length in miles of the sea passage. Suppose that it were desirable to sail from Halifax to Galway instead of from New York to Southampton or Liverpool, the distance would be reduced by about eight hundred miles. In one of the present twenty-knot vessels, such as the "Paris," the amount of coal saved would be over five hundred tons. This saving of coal could be represented in a new ship of the same dimensions by an addition to the motive power, and consequently to the speed also. This increase of speed again in its turn would reduce the quantity of fuel carried, on account of the reduced time during which the ship would be burning coal. The speed gained for these reasons would be almost a knot an hour. Hence from a change of the length of sea passage we have a gain in speed per hour, which would on the New York and Queenstown route be equivalent to a shortening of time by seven hours. The time required to do the reduced distance at the increased speed would be four and a half days. Whether such a route, with its increased number of changes of vehicles, will ever become commercially a success need not be dealt with in this connection. The point to be noticed is that the shortening of the distance to be run tends to increase the speed per hour of the run, and is, therefore, one of the possibilities of augmented ocean speed.

It can readily be seen that, as most of our high-speed vessels carry some cargo, the same increase of speed which is gained by carrying a reduced quantity of fuel may be gained by carrying an amount of cargo reduced by the same quantity. Thus, the fastest ships, which at present carry one thousand to fifteen hundred tons of cargo, could have had one knot per hour more speed if their weight-carrying capability had been reduced by five hundred tons. It must not be supposed that this result could be attained in the present ships by merely omitting to take five hundred tons of their cargo. These five hundred tons must be replaced by additional motive power before this extra knot can be got. But the point to be noted is that the possibility of increased speed lies in the abandonment of all cargo-carrying in high-speed passenger steamers. No doubt there are some classes of cargo which require to be transported at a high rate of speed. But if

it is considered desirable to have ships which shall carry passengers and mails at the highest possible rate of speed, then cargo-carrying must be relegated to slower ships. Here, then, is another possible increase of speed. Could our fastest ships replace their cargo by motive power, they could add from one and a half to two knots per hour to their speed.

The possible increases of speed already named are dependent upon matters which the shipowner must determine and decide. But the marine designer will probably be expected to supply his share of possibilities. He can do nothing to lessen the actual distance between the points of departure and arrival, unless he is considered responsible for wild steering and its consequent increase of the distance actually run. How much is lost from this cause it is very difficult to determine, but when record-breaking depends on minutes in a run of six days, good steering must be an important factor. But if distance cannot be shortened by the designer he can take an important share in reducing the weight to be carried. The introduction of steel and the economy of the triple expansion engine have enabled him to add knots to the speed of Atlantic ships.

Steel of greater strength than that now commonly used for shipbuilding was adopted for special parts of some warships somewhere in the sixties, but it was not until 1875 that steel, as we know it, was an assured success. Its price at that time was three times its present price. To-day we have a metal known as nickel steel, which occupies the same position in relation to the steel of common use to-day that that steel did to iron in 1875. It is just the same price to-day that steel was then. It is, at this price, 40 to 50 per cent. stronger than ordinary steel, which was, in its turn, 40 to 50 per cent. stronger than iron. Shall we get this metal into common use in the next ten years ? If we do, we shall be able to add a knot an hour to our new steamers by its introduction. This possibility of increased speed would probably have become an accomplished fact in the new American Line vessels, were it not for the great first cost of the metal. But we ought to be able to take full advantage of this superior metal in some of the vessels which will be built in the next ten years.

In the machinery which propels the vessel we do not seem to be within sight of any great development which will, *per se,* be the cause of increase of speed. There has been a steady increase

of efficiency of mechanism in the last ten years. The number of revolutions of our best engines has been steadily increasing, the fastest vessels averaging ninety revolutions per minute as against sixty in the early part of the last decade. This means that we are getting more work out of the same-sized machinery. This development will slowly continue, but whether it will reach any large advance upon present practice seems doubtful. The advantage of this development cannot easily be expressed in knots per hour, but it has within itself the possibility of increased speed.

The boilers which give the steam to the machinery are much more susceptible of modification.

There are many types used at present for different purposes, and so much do they vary that some types give three times as much work for every ton of weight that others give. Unfortunately it happens that the boilers in present use are of the heaviest type, and though marine engineers are most anxious to get as much work out of every ton of weight as possible, there has not yet been sufficient experience of continuous sea-going work to justify the adoption of the lighter types of boiler on a large scale. Experiments have been made on board ship with varying success, but these experiments have been almost completely confined to ships of war, where the object sought has rather been to attain the greatest power for a short period than to find what results could be maintained over long periods, such as an Atlantic steamer must be capable of undertaking. Until some one undertakes an experiment with the lighter types of boilers in a vessel which has to perform long-steaming operations, it is not likely that a considerable reduction in the weight of boilers due to a change of type can take place. There is every inducement on the part of those owners of fast Atlantic ships, who are anxious to have still faster ships, to get such an experiment tried.

The results of trials under favorable conditions of different kinds of boilers can be taken as a measure of their relative steaming capabilities. If it can be shown that some one particular type of light boiler of the many which have been tried is capable of reproducing at sea over long distances the superiority which it has shown on trial, then we shall have at once a possible increase of speed due to the adoption of this type of boiler. If, for instance, the locomotive type of boiler, with which nearly all tor-

pedo boats are fitted, can be shown to give on prolonged voyages only two-thirds of its relative superiority on trial, we have at once the possibility of more than a knot an hour of increased speed. This type of boiler is one of the lightest of a class known as tubular boilers, in which the water is outside of the tubes and the fire is inside. There are some very successful boilers of a class known as the tubulous boilers, where the water is inside the tubes and the fire is outside. The performance of these boilers in relation to weight is much better than any of the tubular type. The development of this type promises to be more rapid in America than in Europe, and we may see before long the New World leading the Old in this matter. When this happens the reward of higher speed will certainly follow.

The machinery and boilers are the part of the motive power which is the product of man's skill. The other part is the fuel. The details of the machinery are modified by the kind of fuel which man selects as the best. Hitherto the generally-adopted fuel has been coal. The amount of work done per ton of coal varies considerably, but, except in the matter of expense, there is obviously no reason for selecting for use on shipboard any coal but that which gives the largest amount of work per ton of weight. At present in the fastest ships it is found advantageous to use the most efficient coal, even though the cost per ton is more than fifty per cent. higher than that of fairly-efficient coal. Five per cent. gained in efficiency per ton of coal means nearly a quarter of a knot in speed on a twenty-knot vessel, or nearly two hours on the run between New York and Queenstown. It is therefore obvious that complete knowledge of the work-producing capabilities of the different kinds of fuel is an absolute necessity on the part of the marine designer in order that he may give as much machinery and boiler power as possible consistent with carrying just sufficient coal to enable the vessel to complete her voyage at her highest possible speed. Any deviation from this proper division can only be made at the expense of speed. Too little coal will cause a reduction of speed, as the fuel will have to be economized and power reduced in order to complete the voyage. Too much fuel means that a weight of coal will remain at the end of the voyage which would have served to increase the speed had it been employed partly as extra machinery and partly as extra fuel to drive the extra machinery.

The possibility of obtaining a greater amount of work per ton of fuel is dependent partly upon the possibility of the improved combustion of the fuels at present in use, and partly upon the possibility of the adoption of other fuels with improved work-producing capabilities. It is to the former possibility that attention has been directed within the last few years. The principles of the combustion of coal in boiler furnaces are beginning to be better understood. The adoption of forced draught in various forms has directed attention to the better utilization of the heat which can be developed by this method, and also to the more economical production of that heat. To obtain some measure of the possibilities of increased work by improvements of this nature, it may be stated that boilers of the ordinary marine type have been successfully worked on land for several consecutive days under conditions which gave at least fifty per cent. more work per ton of boiler than our best marine boilers are at present giving. The amount of coal burnt in relation to the work done was better than in ordinary practice; but the point to be noted is that the improved methods of combustion and of utilizing of heat, together, enabled a very much greater amount of work per ton of boiler to be maintained. Whether an equivalent improvement can take place in the results of combustion by these methods in the lighter types of boilers already referred to has not been demonstrated, but there are valid reasons for supposing that such can be obtained. If, therefore, we can combine the advantage of the lighter boiler, with the improved methods of combustion, we may obtain an increased amount of work per ton of boiler and a consequent further increase of speed.

As to the possibility of adopting other fuels than coal, there can be no doubt that for the purpose of getting a ship across the Atlantic at the quickest speed there is at least one fuel that would attain this purpose better than coal. The burning of petroleum in boilers has long since passed beyond the experimental stage as an engineer's question. The cost of this fuel has prevented its adoption as a steam-producing agent everywhere except in the oil-producing regions. It is stated that the supplies are so limited that it is impracticable to adopt oil for ships, as the enormous quantities that would be required would soon make the prices prohibitive. Experiments on an extensive scale have shown that one ton of oil will do as much work as two tons of the best coal.

Here, then, we have a means of saving one-half of the weight of fuel to be carried. The weight saved can be utilized to give a knot and a half more speed.

The question of adopting oil for the purpose of obtaining increased speed in trans-Atlantic travel is one which cannot fail to be interesting to Americans. If the greatest attainable speed is of national importance and that attainment is only possible by the use of oil fuel, the nation possessing the control of oil supplies can, other things being equal, have the fastest ships as long as oil maintains its superiority as a fuel. The supply of oil to these ships at a commercially practicable rate would have to be insured. This might only be practicable by preventing its use for other purposes of less importance nationally. But there are other difficulties which have first to be overcome before oil as a fuel for fast passenger steamships can be generally adopted, not the least of which is the accustoming of passengers to the idea that an oil-fuel ship is as safe as a coal-fuel one. The engineering difficulties are not great, and a much more conveniently-worked ship could be designed if oil fuel were adopted.

In the foregoing some possibilities of increased speed have been enumerated. They may not all be cumulative in their effect, but we may roughly say that should the nickel-steel become cheap enough, and should a lighter type of boiler, such as the locomotive type, become a certain success for continuous sea-going work, the speed may be increased by two knots above present speeds. If oil be the fuel used, the speed may be increased three and a half knots. In other words, the time record from Sandy Hook to Queenstown would be reduced from five days fifteen hours to four days sixteen hours.

The foregoing remarks are on the assumption that no increase is made in the dimensions of the vessels at present doing their twenty knots average sea speed. If any of the principal dimensions, length, breadth, or draught of water be increased, there is a further possibility of increasing speed. Length is the most valuable addition which can be made with a view to increasing speed. Strange as it may seem, it is possible to make some particular forms of vessels go faster for the same engine power by adding to their length. It is possible with some forms to double all their dimensions and to obtain the same speed for half the power. This does not hold in the case of vessels of the form

of our best Atlantic liners. But fifty feet added to the length of one of them, while adding nearly ten per cent. to its gross money-earning capabilities, would not necessitate an addition of more than four per cent. to the engine power to attain the same speed.

Draught is a most valuable addition to a vessel's potentialities for speed, almost as valuable as length. The limitations upon the dimensions of vessels which are due to harbor and dock accommodations are gradually becoming less. But the limitation which retreats least rapidly is that of draught. If we could have added four feet to the draught of our present steamers, making their loading draught thirty feet instead of twenty-six, they could have been designed to have a speed of one and a quarter knots more, or to have a gain of about eight hours on the run across. The harbor authorities on the English side are increasing their draughts. Southampton will very shortly have facilities for vessels of thirty feet draught at all times of the tide.

Increased breadth is not so productive of increased speed as increased length and draught, although breadth must be increased as draught increases.

If, therefore, in addition to improvements in fuel and machinery, it is possible to increase dimensions, we may look for very considerable increases of speed. If the commercial conditions can be fulfilled there is every reason to expect much higher speeds in the next ten years. The fulfilment of the necessary commercial considerations should be insured by the nation. The increase of speed is increase of postal facilities, and the delivery of passengers is postal work in its widest sense. The risk of commercial success in the matter of delivery of letters has been taken by the Government of all civilized countries, and it is not probable that private enterprise could do as well as the postal authorities now do. It does not therefore seem unreasonable to look to the nation to give encouragement to the increase of speed by taking a large share of the risk which accompanies the endeavor to attain this increase. The recent arrangements made by the United States Government to encourage the building of mail steamers in America is a recognition of this principle, but it seems to go scarcely far enough. Take, for instance, the North Atlantic mail service, for which several twenty-knot ships are to be built. Great inducement is offered to make these vessels attain 20-knot speed, but no inducement whatever is given to make them

do more. Hence the arrangements so admirably made to give 20-knot ships will tend to prevent higher speeds from being sought for. If something more should be done in this direction by offering an additional subsidy for each successive increment of speed, obtained above the contract amount, as is done already in the case of the war ships built for the United States Navy, there would then be a very considerable chance of progressive increase of speed. To a nation which is spending so much upon commerce-destroyers, such as the "Columbia," it would be a trifling matter to spend a comparatively small additional sum per year to alter the character of their mail contracts so that a steady development of increased speed should be encouraged. If this were done, the mail steamers would be of more service in time of peace and more formidable in time of war when used as armed cruisers.

The question may now naturally be asked, Should all the possibilities indicated herein be fulfilled, what speed are we likely to reach in, say, the next ten years? Shall we add as many knots per hour to the best speed in the next ten as has been done in the last? Ten years ago the time to cross from New York to Liverpool was practically eight days. The best that has been done up till now is a little over six days. Will the best time in ten years hence be a little over four days? There seems to be good reason to believe that it will be. To leave New York at noon and arrive at Southampton at noon on the fourth day out necessitates a speed of thirty knots an hour. A vessel 1,000 feet long, 100 feet wide, with a draught of water of thirty feet, with a structure built of stronger steel than that at present adopted, with lightened boilers, with oil or some equally light fuel instead of coal, and with the steady general improvements in methods of construction and management of ships and machinery, such a vessel will be capable of crossing the Atlantic in a little over four days. The design of such a vessel will involve the consideration of many problems of structural detail, but there is nothing insuperable in any of the difficulties which will accompany such a project. Whether the carrying out of such a work will be done in the Old or in the New World time can only show, but when it is undertaken, whether by the Old or the New, there is no reason to doubt that it will be successfully carried out.

J. H. Biles.

REFORM OF THE DRINK TRAFFIC.

BY THE REV. W. S. RAINSFORD, D. D.

THE criticisms and suggestions on my article in the May number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, though very numerous, may, I think, without any discourtesy to the writers, be classified under a few heads.

"Let there be a holy church in every village, but also an equally holy tavern with a devout man as tapster, serving in the fear of God," says one, quoting Ruskin. And at the other extreme is the well-meaning and zealous reformer, who assures us that "every clergyman who uses liquor of any sort as a beverage destroys his usefulness in saving his fellows."

Some of the suggestions made are of weight. I shall try to go over the ground they cover as briefly as I can, begging the readers of THE REVIEW, as I do, so again to remember that I am very far from claiming anything like a comprehensive knowledge of this most difficult of modern questions; and that I do not even propose any plan or method of Temperance Reform which professes to serve as a panacea for so deep rooted an ill.

The fundamental mistake of nearly all reformers seems to me to be an unwise haste. Quick methods are apt to be superficial; they may cut off the nettle at the head, while they leave the root still vigorous and untouched.

Several of my correspondents urge the universal acceptance of one or other of certain semi-scientific cures, and cannot see any reason why the clergy or temperance reformers should not publicly advocate the application of such methods to those suffering from alcoholism. Such action, however, would be quite unwarranted. The scientist must apply his rigid tests, the practitioner pursue his experiments; and when the results and conclusions arrived at by both are placed before us, it will be time enough for public teachers to urge on the public the use of such aids as have been proved to be reliable and safe. Science may yet discover for us some means by which the tendencies of hereditary

alcoholism may be counteracted, means by which the man who wishes to break the yoke from his neck may win new strength and take a new start. But there does not seem to be evidence that any method of treatment yet resorted to always does good, while it has been proved that in many cases some of the "cures" are highly dangerous, and the temperance reformer will do well to let such things alone till their full value be proven.

I find it difficult to condense a very able letter written by a gentleman in the West, which sums up with great force almost all the objections that I have heard urged against saloon reform.

"How do you propose to overcome," says my correspondent, "the opposition of saloon-keepers? You suggest no means of limiting their activity as individuals and in union, and they would no doubt continue as powerful as ever and more hostile than ever. You mention no way in which the opposition of political ward heelers may be weakened; nor do you set forth strong reasons for hoping that the Prohibitionists will abandon their cardinal principle, because you make the sale of liquor subordinate to that of food. The success of your plan would pain them more deeply, as being a half measure, than would a great increase in the business of the saloon proper. The many good preachers will continue to rebuke those who taste liquor, and many doubtless would be ready to discipline church members who should frequent such places of resort as you suggest. In short, as your plan becomes more successful and more wide-spread the opposition from the three forces you mentioned would grow hotter." To this I answer that nothing can be done with the Prohibition Party. They are wrong in principle and therefore mistaken in practice. Many good preachers, no doubt, will continue to rebuke those who taste liquor; but as education grows, their number will decrease.

Again, my correspondent says: "Supposing your plan to be comprehensive enough, it must still fail of general application for want of people to carry it on. The retail liquor trade is so uninviting a business to most of those who wish well to temperance, that they can be relied upon to leave it alone. Even if a man is willing to devote himself to conducting a liquor establishment, he could not be successful without a remarkable combination of personal characteristics and outward circumstances. He must have an income more than sufficient to support himself and his

family. He must be the sort of man who attracts people." Here again, perhaps owing to my want of clearness in statement, my correspondent has entirely misunderstood what has been proposed. The sort of saloons that I have suggested ought to pay well; and it should not be difficult therefore to secure respectable men, experienced in the retail liquor business, to conduct them; care, of course, being taken to see that the laws laid down for their management were scrupulously obeyed. Such men there are in plenty. To start and equip such establishments men would have to be found who were willing to take some risk for the sake of trying an experiment. But once let it be proven that there was money in it, I cannot think that it would be hard to secure investors; and, indeed, the history of temperance reform in Norway and Sweden abundantly supports this opinion.

Still, again, my correspondent objects: "The great purpose in keeping such saloons would be to draw people, more especially the lower grades of people, away from the old saloons into these better places. How is this to be done? Those more objectionable forms of entertainment which cannot be introduced into the reformed saloons are the very ones which attract the customers whom it is most important to reach, and you cannot suggest any compensating attraction for your houses, a food counter or anything else, which saloon-keepers cannot and will not obtain for theirs. They can afford to spend money, and they know how to do it effectively. If competition ever arose, the saloons would cut prices and offer attractions beyond anything which reformed houses could do; and would no doubt use the boycott as a means of strengthening their position. When it comes to a struggle for the patronage of the lower classes of workingmen, you could not hope to stand one day against the resources of the saloon-keepers." That objection is well stated; but it applies with greatly diminished force to large cities, of which it should be remembered I am specially speaking. No boycott would be effectual in a large city. Nor can it be doubted that great good would be achieved by forcing the saloons, through competition, to better their methods, even if only to the extent of opening up food counters, varying their class of drinks, and making similar changes. By so much would the public gain.

Indeed, I have received what seems a remarkable suggestion from a saloon-keeper, who assures me that he has done all in his

power to have our licensing law so altered, that where the licensee keeps tables and food, reducing his bar-room and developing his restaurant, the price of his license should be reduced. This retail liquor dealer is altogether in favor of providing saloons, where the customers shall have every opportunity of sitting down at tables, and having their drinks brought to them there; where they shall have every facility of procuring hot food at all times, when the place is open. He is quite confident that such a business enterprise would pay well. And let me say here, that this is no solitary case. I have met many saloon-keepers who, beyond question, were anxious to improve in all ways within their power the business in which they are engaged. It is to such men we need to look for practical suggestion and aid, in shaping any measures of reform; and to ignore them all, to suppose that all of them are men of poor character and unworthy ambition, argues as much ignorance as it does lack of charity.

There are exaggerated ideas abroad as to the opposition that may be expected from the retail liquor dealers to any movement that has for its object the reform of their business. I do not think that they are any worse than those they serve—and among these are the great majority of our respectable working men and women, whose morals are quite up to the average—who, indeed, in my judgment are the most moral element in our city communities.

Temperance reformers as a rule know little of saloons or saloon-keepers, and draw pictures of them which are apt to be somewhat imaginative. The ordinary retailer detests seeing a drunken man on his premises. He thinks a man is a fool to get drunk, and a nuisance when he is drunk—because he is an injury to his business.

This view of the liquor dealer may seem rose colored. Let me quote from one whose name carries as much weight on such a question as the name of any man living—Charles Booth, author of *Life and Labor of the People in London.*

"A most horrible and true picture may be drawn of the trade in drink, of the wickedness and misery that goes with it. So horrible that one cannot wonder that some eyes are blinded to all else, and there is a cry of 'Away with this accursed abomination.' There is, however, much more to be said. Anyone who frequents public houses knows that actual drunkenness is very much the exception. At the worst houses in the worst neighborhoods many, or perhaps most, of those who stand at the bars, whether

men or women, are stamped with the effects of drink, and, if orderly at the moment, are perhaps at other times mad or incapable under its influence; but at the hundreds of respectable public houses scattered plentifully all through the district this is not the case. It could not be. They live by supplying the wants of the bulk of the people, and it is not possible that they should be much worse than the people they serve. Go into any of these houses—the ordinary public house at the corner of any ordinary East End street—there, standing at the counter, or seated on the benches against wall or partition, will be perhaps half a dozen people, men and women, chatting together over their beer—more often beer than spirits; or you may see a few men come in, with no time to lose, briskly drink their glass and go. Behind the bar will be a decent, middle-aged woman, something above her customers in class, very neatly dressed, respecting herself and respected by them. The whole scene comfortable, quiet, and orderly. To these houses those who live near send their children with a jug as readily as they would send them to any other shop. I do not want to press this more cheerful point of view further than is necessary to relieve the darker shades of the picture. I would rather admit the evils and try to show how they may be lessened, and what the tendencies are that make for improvement. It is evident that publicans, like all the rest of us, are feeling the stress of competition. Walk through the streets, and everywhere it may be seen that the public houses are put to it to please their customers. Placards announcing change of management frequently meet the eye, while almost every house vigorously announces its reduced prices. 'So much the worse,' some will say. But no! It is a good thing that they should be considering how to make themselves more attractive. Undermined by the increasing temperance of the people, and subject to direct attack from the cocoa-rooms on the one side and the clubs on the other, the licensed victuallers begin to see that they cannot live by drink alone. Look more closely at the signs in their windows. There is hardly a window that does not show the necessity felt to cater for other wants besides drink. . . . In such a situation it would be a fatal mistake to decrease the number of the houses in the cause of temperance. To encourage the decent and respectable publican by making existence difficult to the disreputable is the better policy, but let us on no account interfere with a natural development, which, if I am right, is making it every day more difficult to make a livelihood by the simple sale of drink."

The objection that there can be no attraction offered in the reformed saloon, which would not be duplicated and improved on in the ordinary saloon, would be a final and unanswerable objection, if it were sought to abolish saloons and stamp out the drink traffic; but this, as I have said, I believe to be neither possible nor desirable in New York any more than it is in London. What I do think can be done is to raise the tone of the saloon by making it less of a bar and more of a restaurant; by throwing it open to the public and removing its blinds, and by improving the quality of its liquor.

One more suggestion has been made. It is that the coöpera-

tive method should be introduced, and the lodgers in several adjoining tenements should support a private saloon, live more at home, spend less, and divide among themselves what are now the profits of the middleman. There is scarcely any department of their lives in which our poor would not be greatly benefited by coöperation; but, unfortunately, they are not sufficiently educated to understand its advantages or to practise them. And indeed, the constant change of habitation which tenement-house life involves would alone, I fear, be at present an insuperable objection to any application of this method to the saloon.

And now let me, if I may, a little more fully state some points of importance. The question before us is largely how to deal with the intemperance of the immigrant peoples. How shall we provide for the needs of those who have come to us from foreign lands, with habits formed in those lands, or for the needs of the children of those who are of foreign birth? There seems to be little doubt that the native American is fast becoming sober. Two generations ago he drank considerably; one generation ago he drank less; and now he is rarely a drunkard. Our difficulty lies in dealing with the various kinships that come from across the sea. If habits of intemperance are ingrained in them there, they find themselves with unusual opportunities of indulging them here.

There surely is one possible cure; and that is, education. This should begin with the children in the public schools; and to do this, we must know more than we know at present about the effects of alcohol. The most contradictory statements have been made on this subject, guaranteed by names of weight; and the ordinary man finds it almost impossible to come to a definite conclusion. On one side, he hears alcohol is poison, pure and simple; on the other, that it is a food. The physiologist takes him into his laboratory and proves to him that alcohol retards the process of digestion, and so is poison. The pathologist, equally certain of his results, proves that when alcohol is taken into the stomach it is so quickly absorbed that it passes out of that member and so is not present to retard digestion; but, on the other hand, helps to increase the secretion of digestive juices. Here, at first sight, seems flat contradiction, but the divergency of opinion is of course to be explained by the different points of view of the pathologist and physiologist.

It ought not to be difficult to-day for doctors and scientific men to agree on simple statements which could find their place in textbooks, and so spread knowledge among the million; but this, as yet, has not been done. And even if it were done, the prejudice of the temperance folk is so strong and so persistently operative that it is very doubtful whether such textbooks could be placed in the schools. A noted temperance organization demanded of one city board of education and a State board that the children under those boards should be taught for two hours weekly the physiological effects of alcohol, while, as a matter of fact, the child could be taught all that is known of its physiological effects in half an hour. The granting of this demand would have simply transformed the teachers into temperance lecturers, and the schools into channels for the dissemination of theories on this subject, which would prove to be misleading, if not absolutely false.

It is very easy to make alcohol a sort of scapegoat on which to pile the sins of the people. The criminal himself, glad of an excuse, attributes his trouble to liquor. But he is scarcely a good judge in his own case. I learn from the best authority that, while the youthful wardens of our prisons generally state in their reports that alcohol is, in a very large proportion of the cases under their charge, a cause of crime, the wardens who have had longer experience attribute to alcoholism a smaller percentage of crime.

I know full well that in such brief space as a magazine article allows me it is impossible to avoid being misunderstood when one deals with such a question as this. It seems to a multitude of good people who judge hastily that nothing but harm can come from any movement or teaching which appears to make light of the awful blight of drunkenness. I must at present, I fear, rest under the censure of such. But what I plead for is a more radical dealing with the evil. As long as conditions of life provoke to drink men will destroy themselves with drinking. As long as they breathe foul air at night, in sleeping quarters all too narrow, they will wake up in the morning with a craving for liquor. As long as they are denied all rational amusement they will go in for "soak" and "debauch." You cannot better the condition of those who are being ruined by the present retail liquor business by attacking only that business which seems the immediate cause of

their ruin. We must do more than this. We must, if we love our fellow men, go down to the root of the matter and seek to alter that.

The one necessary thing to our city workingman is a place where he can spend his afternoon and evening. He has no home, only part of a room at best; perhaps a bed to himself, and this is doubtful. The place where he sleeps is cold in the winter evenings and intolerably hot in the summer. He is actually driven to the saloon; there is no other place for him. To expect him to sit in his single room and look at his bare wall is ridiculous. He might almost as well be in Sing Sing. Nor will your average workingman rush to take advantage of your reading-room, coffee-house, etc., as soon as you throw open its doors to him. He has prejudices. He is afraid of being assailed by those who look down on him, or with whose opinions he does not agree, and he has a righteous objection to being patronized. This is exactly the condition of scores of thousands of unmarried men (I have not time at present to deal with the question as it applies to the married man, whose case is scarcely better) in our large cities. And these are they who are the main support of the present saloon. In the saloon he meets his friends and spends most of his leisure time. With the saloon-keeper he is on friendly terms. Improve his place of resort, and you do much to improve him. It is improving. The reforms most needed are those that will hasten its improvement.

The Gothenberg System came into existence in 1866. For the first sixty years of this century Scandinavia was noted for its drunkenness. In Norway and Sweden there was uncontrolled distillation of brandy, which was and is the popular drink. Every corn grower was practically his own distiller. In 1830 there were no fewer than 170,000 stills at work in Sweden. In 1850 they were reduced to 40,000, and in 1855 a very important law was passed in Sweden, which gave local option to the people. It allowed them to reduce the number of public houses to zero; or it allowed them to continue the existing system of private licenses; or it provided for the establishment of companies to take up those licenses. This legislation applied only to public houses where native brandy was sold. It did not touch beer, which is regarded as a temperance drink.

In 1866, the town of Gothenberg adopted the system now

called by its name. It was that of a limited liability company, pledged to work for the benefit of the public, controlled by the public, and devoting all its surplus profits to the public welfare, after payment of a moderate interest of five per cent. upon the capital of the society. The Municipal Council fixes the number of licenses required to meet the convenience of the public, and grants a monopoly of these to a society formed for the purpose of undertaking the trade, generally for a term of five years at a time. The operations of the society are subject to the control, and its books open to the inspection, of the Council. The statutes, by-laws and regulations, as well as all the appointments in the society's service, must be approved by the Council. The committee of management of the society is formed of a body of representative men, of whom a certain proportion are elected by the shareholders, while the remainder are appointed by the Municipal Council, and may or may not be shareholders; or may or may not be Municipal Councillors. This system has now been applied to the municipalities in Norway so generally that there are only three small villages, numbering in all a little over 1,200 people, who have not adopted it.

There is one important distinction, however, in the working of the law in the two countries. The surplus over and above five per cent. paid to the shareholders goes, under the Gothenberg System, to the local municipal treasury; while under the Norwegian System, it is used in works of charity and public utility, such as parks, etc. There seems considerable danger attaching to any system which hands over large sums of money to a local municipal treasury; as local authorities have then as good reason as private persons for pushing the sale of liquor.

In 1876 there were twenty-two societies formed under this law in operation in Norway; and the total consumption of ardent spirits in that country was 12,300,000 litres. In 1889 there were fifty-one societies, and the total consumption had fallen to 5,600,000. A practical application of this system is now proposed for Massachusetts, the features of which are embodied in the following bill recently submitted to the legislature by Mr. C. F. Dole, and entitled "An Act as to the Norwegian System of Dispensing Intoxicating Liquors:"

SECTION 1. The voters of each town at its annual meeting, and of each ward in any city at its annual municipal election, shall have an opportunity

to vote "yes" or "no" upon the question whether the Norwegian System, as hereinafter stated, of dispensing intoxicating liquors, shall be adopted in said town or ward, and if a majority of the voters shall vote in the affirmative, then the licensing power therein shall grant a license of the first five classes in section ten of chapter one hundred of the Public Statutes, without charge, to a corporation to be formed by ten or more citizens thereof, whose officers shall consist of president, secretary and a board of directors of not less than five nor more than ten persons, and otherwise formed according to general laws, and such corporation shall establish a place or places for dispensing said liquors not exceeding the number now provided by law for license, and no license of any of said five classes shall be granted to any other party in said town or ward of a city, except hotels and clubs. There shall be only one such corporation in said ward or town, and no such corporation shall be formed without the approval of a justice of the superior court, after suitable notice to the public ; and if more than one such corporation is desired, said justice shall determine which one shall exist and take such license. No liquors shall be sold to any man intoxicated, or to a minor under sixteen years of age, or on credit, and no such minor shall be allowed on the premises, and no adulterated liquors shall be sold. Such corporation shall have such by-laws not inconsistent herewith as the stockholders may make; and no such corporation shall be allowed to take a license or dispense any of said liquors until its organization and by-laws shall have been approved by a justice of the superior court. The capital necessary to carry on a business of dispensing said liquors by the corporation shall be paid in by those who subscribe for the stock, and no stockholder shall receive more than a dividend of five per cent. per annum, payable semi-annually on his stock: and after all the expenses of the business and the dividend has been paid, the balance of net profit shall be distributed at a fixed time in each year for such charitable and industrial purposes in said ward or town as the stockholders and the board of directors, separately, may approve: *provided, however*, that no such distribution shall be made without the approval of one of said justices, and such justice shall determine how and to whom the same shall be given, and his decision shall be final.

SEC. 2. The provisions of law as to voting upon license questions shall apply to said question relating to the Norwegian system.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect upon its passage.

The liquor question is far from settled—the lines along which we are to seek its solution are not even laid down as yet. On all hands men recognize its importance and recognize also the futility of those means that so far have been employed for grappling with it. For myself, I cannot feel any great enthusiasm for immediate legislation. Whether it take the shape suggested in Mr. C. F. Dole's Massachusetts Bill, or attempt a State monopoly, as under the lead of Governor Tillman the South Carolinians seem bent on doing, we can gain little permanent good by enacting laws so long as we know so little and are so divided in opinion. Laws that are the result of moral panic or that do not represent

the mature convictions of the bulk of the people simply serve as an excuse for personal effort in the direction of reform, and soon fail of their purpose. For many a day to come we must depend chiefly on personal effort. Earnest men who will not readily be discouraged and who command universal respect, men of moderation and of means, are wanted. They can establish decent restaurant-saloons, where music is provided; decent places where people will be ashamed to get drunk; where all things make for moderation, not excess; where the laws could be obeyed absolutely, no blackmail paid to any one, and all business done on a cash basis.

These, when wisely placed, would pay a reasonable interest on money invested in them—and they would be a perpetual object-lesson of great value. They would draw the attention of the capitalist as a safe investment; and soon, when his prejudices were overcome, the sober and temperate portion of the working population would discover in them the very thing it needs so sorely—an innocent place of rest and recuperation, where families as well as individuals may escape from the narrowness of home.

W. S. RAINSFORD.

THE FINANCIAL OUTLOOK.

BY THE HON. W. BOURKE COCKRAN, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM NEW YORK.

RECENT events have operated to concentrate the attention of the world upon the monetary system of the United States. The financial policy established by the act of 1890 is universally condemned, but public opinion is by no means unanimous as to the policy which should be substituted for it.

In the last Congress an attempt was made to abrogate that portion of the act of 1890 known as the Sherman Law, which provides for the annual purchase of 54,000,000 ounces of silver by the government, but it failed, because men who openly denounced the law voted against every attempt to modify its provisions. Many members who voted against the act providing for the suspension of silver purchases justified their course by the statement that they would never consent to the repeal of the Sherman Act "*unless some satisfactory substitute were adopted.*"

This disposition to make the repeal of the Sherman law conditional upon the adoption of some scheme of silver coinage throws a doubt over the future financial policy of the country. The recent utterances of the President and of the Secretary of the Treasury, however, appear to settle beyond question that the present Administration is determined to use all the means at its command to maintain a gold standard.

A discussion of the future financial policy of the United States therefore involves three questions: *First*, whether any further compromise between the advocates and opponents of free coinage of silver by this government be possible or advisable; *Second*, whether the discretionary powers vested in the Treasury Department by existing laws can be exercised so as to maintain a sound currency; and, *Third*, whether there be any prospect of an ultimate repeal of that part of the Sherman Act which provides for the purchase of large quantities of silver bullion.

The question of free coinage of silver by the United States may be excluded from consideration as nobody deems the passage of such a law within the limits of possibility during the present administration.

I.

It must be apparent to every thoughtful observer that any further experiments in the direction of a limited silver coinage would be productive of nothing but confusion and disorder. The statement of those who declare that while they do not believe in the Sherman Law "they will vote against its repeal unless some satisfactory substitute be adopted" offers no suggestion of future legislation worthy of attention.

The policy which has involved the finances of the United States in a confusion without parallel in the history of prosperous nations is due to the folly of attempting to compromise an economic principle. Economic laws are not the product of legislation; they are the result of forces which no one country can affect, and which the combined legislation of all nations could not permanently control. An attempt to compromise an economic law is about as intelligent a proceeding as an attempt to compromise the state of the weather or the course of the seasons. If two men, joint owners of a field, disputed the proper season for planting grain, one insisting it should be planted in April, the other contending it should be planted in October, and they should compromise by planting it in January, does any sane man believe that a fruitful crop would crown the husbandry which had been the result of such a compromise? The men who scattered seed upon the ground at a period when the laws of nature necessarily made it unproductive would have exercised an undoubted individual right, but their course would have exposed them to the pity and the ridicule of sensible men. So, in treating subjects controlled by economic laws, contending members of a legislature may agree upon a compromise which will prove effective to close debate and postpone discussion, but the economic laws will be in no wise affected by their arrangement, and if the scheme which they adopt be out of harmony with those laws the result will be disastrous to commercial prosperity.

The Bland Act of 1878 and the Sherman Law of 1890 were both compromises between the views entertained by advocates of free coinage and the opponents of it. Both have resulted disastrously to the country and both are to-day condemned by men of all shades of opinion upon the financial question. If government cannot control the course of economic laws, its only prudent course is to act in obedience to them so far as they may have been ascertained. There is no sensible middle course between the free coinage of silver and the total demonetization of silver. If silver be admitted to coinage at all it should be admitted freely and fully, without any restriction. A limited coinage of any metal forces the government to become a purchaser of it, and therefore reduces it to the status of a commodity. Whether admitted freely to the mint or totally excluded from it, a metal will always find its natural level. If it be made the subject of government speculation its commercial value is subject to arbitrary interference, with the inevitable result of depreciation.

It is quite true that the standard dollars coined under the Bland Act of 1878 circulated freely in this country at their par value, and Mr. Cleveland's memorable letter to Mr. Warner, written in 1885, is often cited to prove that the gloomy prophecies of those who were opposed to that law have never been fulfilled. Although these silver dollars never sank to a discount, Mr. Cleveland's letter was none the less a substantially sound statement of the financial confusion which would have inevitably arisen out of the operation of the Bland Act if it had continued in existence. His prognostication was inaccurate, only, in speaking of the danger as immediate, when in fact it was remote. The Bland silver dollars circulated in this country at their par value, because there was one perfectly solvent institution which was forced to accept them at that valuation. The law having made them receivable in payment of debts due to the Government, they could always be paid into the Treasury at their par value in gold. But the capacity of the Government to absorb these dollars was necessarily limited to the extent of its revenues. If the Bland Act had remained in force until the number of standard dollars coined had largely exceeded the total revenues of the Government, there would have been no place at which the surplus could be exchanged at par with the gold dollar. As they became redundant, the inability to export them freely would have become apparent, and

they would inevitably have depreciated to the bullion value of the silver which they contained.

It has been suggested that a revival of the Bland Act might prove a satisfactory measure to those who admit the failure of the Sherman Law, yet hesitate to vote for its repeal. Of the two laws the Bland Act is in every way the more vicious. The Bland Act remained in operation some twelve years, and if it were now revived it is reasonable to assume that an equally long period would elapse before it could be again disturbed. By that time there would be over eight hundred million standard dollars in actual circulation, a greater amount than the Treasury could absorb, and since nobody would be bound to accept the surplus they would at once sink to a discount, and the currency of the country would be reduced to the condition foreseen by Mr. Cleveland in 1885.

In the operation of the Sherman Act the Government is subjected to a heavy loss. The bullion which it purchases is a steadily depreciating commodity, but the loss falls upon the Government which is responsible for the senseless legislation which produces it. If the dollar coined under the operation of the Bland Act sank to a discount it would mean a shrinkage in the value of the money in the pocket of the citizen. Where a vicious or unsound financial policy is pursued by a government, it is manifestly better that the loss accruing from it should fall upon the government which is responsible for it, rather than upon the citizen who is the victim of it. The Sherman Act is the most absurd financial measure ever adopted by a civilized nation, but its very absurdity furnishes a reason for believing that its repeal will soon be accomplished.

II.

SINCE it is certain that no measure providing for the free coinage of silver can become a law during the next four years, and as any further attempt to control economic laws by compromise legislation would be indefensible, the question arises how far can the government maintain a sound currency with the powers intrusted to it by the existing statute.

Under the Sherman Act the government is compelled to purchase 54,000,000 ounces of silver every year at the market value of the metal. In payment of this silver the Government issues notes

payable "*in coin,*" which manifestly means in gold or silver coin. The statute, however, requires the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain the parity between gold and silver. In order to obey this last provision of the law it is plain that in redeeming these notes the Secretary is bound either to redeem them in gold or in an amount of silver equivalent to their face value in gold.

Under both the Republican and Democratic administrations the Treasury Department has placed this interpretation upon the law. Under this interpretation, the silver purchased by the Government cannot be used in the redemption of the coin notes. It remains idle in the vaults of the Treasury, precisely as if it were iron, or hay, or barley, or tobacco.

In the course of the debate upon the free coinage bill in March, 1892, Mr. Bland declared that the notes issued under the Sherman law were practically gold notes, and in this view every reasonable man must concur. These notes are mere evidences of debt due by the Government. Evidences of debt issued by a government are subject to the same economic laws as evidences of debt issued by individuals or corporations. The value of a promise to pay depends upon the ability and the willingness of the promiser to redeem his obligation.

While the Sherman law makes it compulsory upon the Government to continue issuing paper for the purchase of 4,500,000 ounces of silver every month, it does not empower the Treasury to obtain any gold wherewith to redeem them. Every increase in the number of the notes involves an obligation to acquire a larger supply of gold. As these notes are forced into circulation they displace and expel some other form of currency, and as gold is the only money of international value it is steadily withdrawn from the Treasury for export. The holders of the notes, seeing their volume increase while the amount of gold available for their redemption decreases, become doubtful of their value and they hasten to take advantage of the law which allows them to be used in discharge of debts due to the Government. The inevitable result follows. The revenues of the Government are substantially paid in its own paper obligations, and thus the policy which makes it imperative upon the Government to obtain an extraordinary supply of gold becomes the means of preventing it from obtaining even the supply which under ordinary conditions would be yielded by its revenues.

A premium on gold, that is to say, a willingness on the part of those who hold Government paper to exchange it for less than its face value in gold will be the inevitable result of a widespread distrust of the Government's capacity to redeem its obligations. As this, however, would be a great hardship upon the innocent holders of Government paper, and as it would entail the most serious consequences, the Treasury is morally bound to maintain the value of its notes by all the means at its command.

A government can only obtain gold by collecting it as part of its revenues or by borrowing it. The reports of the Treasury show that under existing financial conditions it is idle to hope that its dwindling stock of gold can be replenished by the proceeds of taxation. If the present drain on its resources be continued the Government will therefore be forced to pledge its credit in order to obtain the gold necessary to redeem its obligations.

The withdrawal of gold has undoubtedly been stimulated by the fear that this country was rapidly drifting to a silver basis. If the commercial world become convinced that the Government intends to maintain a gold standard at whatever cost, and that if its revenues do not yield sufficient gold to meet its obligations it will pledge its credit to secure an adequate supply, confidence in the soundness of its paper would be largely restored, and the outflow of gold would be sensibly checked.

There is little doubt that the credit of the Government is sufficiently high to warrant the belief that it can obtain all the gold it may need at the rate of from two and one-half to three per cent. The credit of the Government being undoubted the moment its willingness to pledge it became established, confidence in its notes would be restored. Gold which is now hoarded would be freely restored to circulation, because each coin note would become practically a gold certificate of deposit issued by the Government and would be just as valuable as the coin itself.

It is true that the Sherman Law does not authorize the Government to borrow gold for the redemption of notes issued under its provisions. The resumption act, however, empowers the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow whatever gold may be necessary to redeem all outstanding United States notes commonly called greenbacks. There are now about three hundred and forty-six millions of these notes in circulation, and under the law they cannot be cancelled on redemption but must be reissued.

Since the greenbacks must be kept in circulation the power to borrow gold for their redemption is necessarily continuous.

While, therefore, gold could not be borrowed for the direct purpose of redeeming the coin notes issued under the Act of 1890, yet these notes could be exchanged at the Treasury for United States notes—greenbacks—and these latter could in turn be exchanged for gold coins. This would be an indirect but effective method of maintaining gold payments on the paper issued against the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of the Sherman Law. It would, moreover, be a practical demonetization of silver and a substantial adoption of the gold standard. While the operation of the Sherman law would still impose a severe strain upon the country, its financial system would nevertheless remain upon a sound basis. The continued purchase of silver would still be a wasteful, extravagant, and ridiculous performance, but it would in no way affect the currency of the country, except in so far as it would increase the number of government obligations forced into the circulation.

III.

The Sherman law has been the parent of many evils, and many have been attributed to it for which it was not responsible. When we consider the forces that have hitherto sustained it, there is reason to hope for its repeal. The advocates of free coinage of silver are themselves dissatisfied with it; yet they have maintained it on the statute book, because they foresaw that under its operation a time would come when the public revenues would be substantially paid in government paper, and they hoped that the Treasury, deprived of any supply of gold, would be forced to coin the silver bullion in its vaults and use it in redemption of its obligations. But the determination of the Administration to maintain the gold standard at all hazards has defeated this expectation. The Government can obtain on its credit the gold which its income fails to supply. With the country upon a gold basis, the Sherman law will ultimately have no more active opponent than the producer of silver.

The act itself is a distinct violation of all economic laws and like all similar acts its results have been most disastrous to those whose interests it was expected to subserve.

If men be governed by the ordinary rules of human prudence it is safe to assume that it will soon be repealed by the consent of those who now support it. It was passed for the purpose of maintaining the price of silver. Its effect has been to depreciate it. In 1873 silver was demonetized by Germany and the United States and the coinage of silver was suspended in France ; yet in the two years between 1873 and 1875 the fall in the price of silver was only about five and one-fifth cents an ounce. In 1890 the Sherman law was passed and during the two years from 1890 to 1892 the price of silver fell about seventeen cents an ounce. From 1874 to 1875 silver declined about three and one-fifth cents an ounce ; from 1891 to 1892 it declined about eleven cents an ounce. Its downward course since the adoption of the Sherman law has been vastly more rapid than at any period since 1873. The production of silver throughout the world in 1892 was about equal to its production in 1891, and this rapid shrinkage in value cannot, therefore, be ascribed to increased production. Its depreciation has been caused by the policy of the Government, and it has proceeded according to perfectly well-settled economic laws.

To many the economic significance of the word purchaser is the same as that of the word consumer ; and in the practical operations of life the purchaser is either a consumer or the agent of a consumer. But the Government is an exception to this rule. While it is a purchaser of silver, in no sense is it a consumer of silver. On the contrary, it is an efficient agency to prevent consumption. Every ounce of silver stored in the Treasury increases the visible supply of the commodity and by increasing the visible supply necessarily depreciates the price. As the amount in the Treasury increases the commercial world becomes convinced that sooner or later the Government must throw it on the market. It is fair to assume that great as the depreciation has been this year, with each addition to the stock in the Government vaults the price will diminish with increased rapidity. In the light of this experience, it is difficult to see what benefit the mine owner has reaped from this legislation, which was conceived in especial benevolence for him. The provision which forces the Government to purchase his product is of no substantial benefit to him. If the Sherman law never had been passed he could have deposited his metal in any warehouse in any city, and upon the

warehouse certificate he could have borrowed ninety per cent. of its face value in any bank in the world. But ninety per cent. of the value of silver in 1889 was equal to more money than one hundred per cent. of its value to-day. The money which he could have borrowed in the open market would have been available for use through the exchanges in any quarter of the globe. Moreover, his product would have been open to consumption. He could have freely disposed of it under general commercial usages, and every ounce consumed would have helped to stimulate or maintain the market price of the metal. Scattered in various parts of the world the supply would not have been, as it is now, concentrated in one spot, a portentous cloud hanging over the market, disturbing confidence and depreciating values. It is amazing that the mine owner has not long since opened his eyes to this aspect of the question. Sooner or later he will realize that his own interests are being jeopardized by the operation of this act, and he will join in a movement to repeal it. In order to convince him of its pernicious effects it may be necessary that his product should sink from eighty-three cents to seventy-five, or sixty or fifty cents an ounce. If the Sherman law continue in operation it is certain that the value of silver will reach a point low enough to satisfy him that he is the principal sufferer from its operation. When it shall have been finally wiped from the statute book the Government will be the possessor of a vast amount of bullion against which it will have issued notes, whose face value will in all probability far exceed the value of the bullion. But this loss will be the penalty which the Government must pay for the experiment in which it has indulged.

It must not be inferred from what has been written that those who believe that this government should go immediately to a gold basis are opposed to bimetallism. The writer of this article believes that the business of the world will never be on a stable basis until the free coinage of silver shall have been restored throughout the world. The difference between those who support free coinage by the United States at the present time and those who oppose it is simply a difference of opinion as to the methods by which bimetallism may be reached. Mr. Bland professes to believe that free coinage of silver by the United States would immediately restore silver to a parity with gold, yet the measure which he introduced in the House was not a free-

coinage measure, but a measure for the issuance of Treasury notes in return for silver bullion, which notes should be redeemable in silver or gold at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury. If Mr. Bland's theory that the coinage of silver by the United States would restore the two metals to a parity were well founded nobody would object to his measure. But since the depreciation of silver did not result from its demonetization by any one country, but from a general movement to a gold standard throughout the world, it is very unlikely that its restoration to coinage by one nation would be sufficient to counteract the effect of its demonetization by several nations.

The universal adoption of a gold standard will present a very serious problem to the commercial world.

Mr. Gladstone, in a recent speech, spoke of existing monetary conditions as being satisfactory to England, and it is undoubtedly true that existing conditions are highly favorable to her. While silver is maintained in the coinage of several countries it is part of the metallic money of the world. But if this country and other countries go to a gold basis Great Britain will be forced to face, not the question of conserving existing conditions, but the question how to meet new conditions. The full tender metallic money of the world consists in round numbers of about 7,000,000,000 of dollars, of which very nearly one-half is silver. If silver be universally demonetized the metallic money of the world will be reduced one-half, and the problem which would then confront all commercial countries would be the possibility of maintaining the business of the world with one-half the existing stock of metallic money. If actual experiment proved that 3,632,605,000 gold dollars formed a sufficient money basis on which to transact the whole business of international exchange, the demonetization of silver would undoubtedly be a salutary measure. If, on the other hand, experience proved that this tremendous reduction in the stock of metallic money tended to unsettle credit and paralyze enterprise, silver would be recalled into coinage by the concurrent demand of the people of the whole world.

Any country which enjoys the benefit of a single monetary standard will be very unlikely to experiment with a double standard, merely to simplify the domestic politics of some other country. England will maintain the gold standard so long as the

total volume of metallic money throughout the world is helped out by the silver circulation of countries that maintain the double standard or the single silver standard. What she may do when confronted with such a reduction in the volume of metallic money in the world as would be caused by a general demonetization of silver no man can say. But it is certain that if the United States join this general movement towards a gold standard she will occupy the strongest position of any nation in the world. She is not an exporter of luxuries, but of necessaries. The things which she has to sell are the things which are essential to the support of life. Whatever may be the prevailing currency of the world, a large proportion of it must necessarily flow to her shores.

The dislocation of the par between silver and gold was in the judgment of many a reckless and ill-advised experiment. For centuries these metals had remained at a parity. The legislation which caused the divergence in their values may have been shortsighted and pernicious. But while it may be deplored it cannot be remedied by the isolated action of a single country. "The battle of the standards" which Mr. Bland foresees cannot be decided by legislation. Silver will be remonetized if the necessities of trade demand its remonetization. When all the commercial nations are brought face to face with the consequences of its universal demonetization the imperious necessities of commerce will bring about a final solution of the coinage question.

W. Bourke Cockran.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

CHRIST AS AN ORATOR.

THIS most important subject has been certainly overlooked. There is no treatise professing to deal with the expressional gifts of the greatest extempore orator the world has beheld. For two thousand years the human race has been led by the teachings of a man who, so far as can be discerned, never committed a thought to writing. There is only one historical mention of even His ability to write, and that was in the case of the woman taken in adultery; when He stooped down and wrote on the ground. What He wrote we know not, it may have been signs or figures, not words; it may have been merely meaningless lines to cover His embarrassment or the nature of His reflections. His recorded sayings were not written by Himself, but by His followers. The world owes its enlightenment, its release from crude faith and superstitious practices to the discourses of Jesus Christ. Why, then, has nothing been written upon the subject of His oratory? Because men have failed to see that Christ must employ the language of public discourse. The prophets spoke of Him in language which indicates His oratoric mission. "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of council and might, and the spirit of knowledge; and he shall smite the earth with the rod of His *mouth* and with the breath of His *lips* shall He slay the wicked." These are the highest endowments for a public speaker. In what terms could this mission be more clearly indicated. He would regenerate the world and bring all men under His sway, not by the sword but by His words. Christ recognized His mission as that of a great sacred orator, for He declared: "God has anointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor." The men of His day regarded Him as a great speaker. On many occasions, while speaking, the people loudly praised His discourse in terms that reflect His oratorical power, for they were carried away by His words. So attractive and commanding were the tones of His voice that many declared that He spoke as one having authority and not as the scribes. The band of officers which the Sanhedrim sent to entrap Jesus returned without accomplishing the mission, and gave as a reason why they did not apprehend Him, not that He worked miracles, but that His speech was so persuasive that they could do nothing but listen, "for never man spake like this man."

It is of no little importance that this subject receive attention.

The correct interpretation of the sayings of Jesus depends upon how truly we understand His oratorical expressions. His methods of speech throw much light upon difficult sayings. Much of the obscurity that envelops the words of Jesus would vanish if we could supply the look, gesture or tone of voice that He used. It is characteristic of extempore speech to be

elliptical or to abound in figures of rhetoric and exaggerated expressions; and these, though readily understood at the time of utterance, have to be carefully weighed and freed from over-statement before the reader can glean the correct meaning.

Many of the divisions of Christendom have been made by interpreting the oratorical language of Christ literally, and the first necessary step towards uniting all bodies of Christians is to interpret the truth of Christ in the light of reason, as in studying the expressions of all great speakers. Some say it was unwise for Christ to use oratorical expressions, but He only obeyed the laws of His nature. It is natural for men of high feeling and enthusiasm to speak strongly. Oratorical language, because highly passionate, is more clear than the trite and commonplace expressions, and renders truth more solemn, elevated, and impressive. A study of Christ as an orator has a most important bearing upon exegesis. The bungling attempts of many commentators to explain certain apparently obscure passages, and their wrong interpretation of others, is due mainly to their failure to study the oratoric method of Christ.

Christ said upon one occasion: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven." It is really amusing to wade through the ingenious efforts to explain this expression literally. Column on column has been written upon it by learned divines. All kinds of suppositions have been made about low gates and small doors at the entrance to Jerusalem, through which camels entered with difficulty. It is simply an oratorical expression for the performance of some very difficult task, like the old proverb "You might as well look for a needle in a haystack." This is only one of many passages in Christ's sermons which are puzzles, for a like reason. If Christ did not speak in the strong language of the orator, then many of his commandments are against human love. We are taught to hate father and mother, to pluck out our eyes and cut off our hands and feet if they offend us. Much of the mortification and self-inflicted torture of the monks of old, as well as many cruel acts, were inspired by a literal interpretation of rhetorical expressions.

The teachings of Jesus as given by the Evangelists are full of contradictions if interpreted literally. The parables of Lazarus and the Prodigal Son are antagonistic and irreconcilable unless we look upon them as vivid oratorical pictures of two sides of God's nature. Now Christ speaks of God's love in the strongest language; then He represents God in the character of a punisher who will plunge his children into endless torment.

Even the ordinary utterances of Christ present contradictions, if we lose sight of his oratorical method. He told His disciples that His mission was one of peace. Then he declared that He had not come to bring peace but war, to turn the son against the father, the mother-in-law against the daughter-in-law. The endeavor to interpret the sayings of Christ literally has led to much diversity of opinion in regard to what He taught in every department of social, moral and political life. It has led to the establishment of false social systems. The old Puritan took the strong phrases of Christ in their extreme literal sense. Many modern socialistic teachings are founded upon narrow literal interpretations of the antithetical and figurative language of Christ.

In the space allotted to us we can but give a superficial glance at some of the leading oratorical elements of Christ's discourses. He was an orator in every sense of the word. There is a closer connection between the form and

spirit of His discourses than in the case of any other orator. He chose the most striking ways of presenting truth. Figures of speech, illustrations and parables are as thick in his sermons as stars in the milky way. The general manner of his address was direct or conversational. He always had His audience in mind and held the attention by His interrogative style. "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings!" "What went ye out into the wilderness to see?" At times He commanded His audience. "Be not afraid of them that kill the body. Let your loins be girded about and your light burning." At other times He warns, rebukes, reproves, reproaches, prohibits. "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees; ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky and the earth." "Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee." This form of direct address often becomes sympathetic, as if He held His audience in His mind and knew their frailties. "Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden and I will give you rest." He was impressed deeply with the great truth that things in heaven are known by their likeness to things on the earth; hence He often speaks in the language of oratoric correspondence. His most remarkable figure of this nature is His comparison of Himself to a vine. Contrast and antithesis abound: "If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish will he give him a serpent? Or if he ask an egg will he give him a scorpion?" So truly oratorical was the style of Jesus that He touched every chord of the human heart. A man of keen sensibilities, sympathetic by nature, and living amid scenes of distress, sorrow and poverty, His heart was easily moved, and therefore His pathetic eloquence was deep, sincere and unsurpassed. Take, for example, His mournful dirge over Jerusalem. His story of the Prodigal's return has no equal for tender pathos in the records of oratory. And yet while the tender and loving prevails in His discourse, no orator has ever uttered such fierce denunciations and bitter sarcasms. "Beware of the Scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and love greetings in the market places and the highest seats in the synagogues and the chief rooms at the feasts, which devour widows' houses and for a show make long prayers; the same shall receive greater damnation."

Briefly stated, the style of Christ is so oratorical that His sermons abound in examples of almost every figure of speech and every kind of eloquence, from the simple to the passionate. There is even found examples of wit and humor. His wit often shone brightly in His replies to the arguments of His opponents. His audience must have smiled with approval when they saw the sharp thrust or sarcastic turn by which His opponents were defeated. How keen His wit in His famous reply to the Pharisees when they said that He cast out devils by the power of Beelzebub: "If I by the power of Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?"

We have shown clearly that the word language of Christ was beyond all question oratorical. It can also be shown that He enforced His truths by those other agents of oratory, voice and gesture. We may be well assured that Christ had a beautiful and graceful body. There are no mentions of any physical defects. The leaders of the Jews who were opposed to Christ's teachings would have seized upon such defects if they existed to show that he was not the Messiah. The life that Christ led, preaching in the open air and even resting at night in the mountains of His native country, bespeaks a strong constitution. But we are not left in doubt in regard to the excel-

lence of His voice or the dramatic force of his gestures. We learn that He held the attention of multitudes in the open air, speaking from the hillside or from a boat anchored in the lake. It is not an easy matter to address several thousand people in the open air, and his audience seldom numbered less than five thousand people, and sometimes many more. That His voice was skilfully modulated appears from many expressions (such as "speaking with a loud voice") in the sacred writers.

They had even observed the changes which the passions made upon His voice, for they declare that He spoke at times with anger. The very words signifying to preach or speak are interchanged at times for words that mean loud or animated or round full utterance. There is strong evidence that His voice was very flexible and could express every shade of emotion. The language he uses, from sarcasm to pathos, denotes an oratoric nature, such that unless the tones of voice corresponded to the passions His audience would have regarded him as insincere. A most wonderful quality of Christ's voice was its power to convey a healing magnetism. The tones of His voice awakened new life in the penitent, in the dead and dying. The leper arose, cleansed; the blind received his sight; the deaf heard and the dumb spake at the sound of His voice. As a weapon of oratory Christ made good use of gesture. He often pointed to the object while speaking: "Behold those buildings;" or with a circular motion of His hand: "Behold my mother and brethren." Sometimes His stories or parables were acted illustrations, little gesture dramas, as in the washing of the disciples' feet. His countenance had a most marvellous variety of expression. By a look or motion of His eye He made His enemies quail. He could preach an impressive sermon by an encircling glance of the eye. His look made Peter go forth from the Council Chamber a broken penitent. Sometimes, even when He said nothing, He revealed His soul by His countenance.

We have tried to present briefly to the reader a great and new subject of extreme importance. We have thrown out a few reflections in regard to a much neglected side of Christ's nature, the expressional side. In our opinion no satisfactory or harmonious interpretation of the words of Christ can be obtained unless more careful study is given to the oratorical characteristics of His style.

We regret that space compels us to deal so concisely with such an important and many-sided subject.

T. Alexander Hyde.

A FARMER'S VIEW OF FREE COINAGE.

It is a singular fact that while the farmers are almost a unit in their demand for free coinage their city cousins are equally desirous to maintain the single standard. We find the city arrayed against the country on this great financial question. Surely, while the cities are so dependent upon the prosperity of the country, the two ought not to be divided as to the correct solution of the problem.

With the single standard, as we have it now, and inadequate supply of the circulating medium, a dollar becomes daily dearer and the products of industry become cheaper and cheaper. We hear much about scaling down debts, but who hears anything about scaling up debts? Yet this is what is

done by maintaining constancy in the supply of money, while the population and business of the country are rapidly increasing, and requiring more money to facilitate exchanges. The volume of business in the United States is growing faster than anywhere else in the world, because of the larger population and of the rapid development of the resources of the country.

Another cause of this rapid increase is to be found in the greater division of labor. Fewer opportunities are offered for barter, while the growth of cities has made it necessary to drop the small credit system. All these causes point to the necessity for a larger circulation. The present yield of gold will not keep pace with the demands of business. Two ways of meeting this difficulty are suggested: Free coinage of silver and the issuing of greenbacks. Many who have studied the subject take the stand that silver is the most available, and the least dangerous means of reinforcing the currency.

Even the most radical monometallist must see that the money we have now is not more than present business activity requires; but population is increasing at the rate of 2½ per cent. a year, business at the rate of 8 per cent. a year, and the circulating medium is remaining comparatively constant. Decreasing the currency raises the value of a dollar, and the debtor class must suffer to benefit the creditor. If you destroy one-third of the money, debts will jump to 150 per cent.—50 per cent. more than justice. The same result is reached if the amount of money is kept constant, while the business of the country is rapidly growing. This is the test: If the prices fall the currency is insufficient.

Agriculture is the basis upon which the whole superstructure of our national welfare must rest. When there is a widespread failure in crops, we see universal hard times. All classes feel the depression in business. First of all it comes to the farmer, he being the man who produces most of the raw material; who wins from nature her treasures by hardest toil, and who in exchange for the products of his industry takes manufactured articles, machinery and merchandise. He is the greatest sufferer.

This is a question of the greatest interest to farmers, and other industrial borrowers.

The cry for an honest dollar is but a subterfuge to hide the dishonesty of the present dollar, and the contempt for the white metal is but a pretence to conceal the real motive for this great attachment to the gold standard.

If we are content with the single standard, the volume of currency and, therefore, the amount available *per capita*, is very small. With this state of affairs, the money powers can withdraw at will a sufficient amount of cash from the circulation to bring about a condition of such pressure that money cannot be secured on government bonds, as was actually the case in Chicago in the winter of 1890.

It has been said that the amount of money can make no difference in the prosperity of the country. If the supply is abundant prices will be high; if the supply is small prices will be low, and the same work will be done by a less quantity in circulation. A relation does certainly exist between the supply of money and its value; but it is a mistake to consider that this conclusion must follow.

Nothing causes greater distress than a decrease in the amount of money. A small increase, however, does not have the opposite effect, since money tends to grow in value.

At the present time any person may take gold to the mint and receive its full weight in gold coin. We are only asking that the same privilege be extended to the holders of silver. The law now in force is an unjust discrimination against silver in favor of gold, and it is this alone which has brought about the present disparity of their values. Silver at one time under free coinage was at a premium above gold. It is not that silver has lost, but that gold has gained in the last decade. This has been brought about partly by the larger output of silver, partly by the relative decrease in the gold produced, but most of all by the demonetization of silver. It is claimed that free coinage would bring inflation. All the silver in the world amounts to about $3,700,000,000. If it were all dumped down here at once it would only make about $58 *per capita*. The same authority claims that it would bring contraction. As to that, for eighty years silver and gold were coined free, and there was no more disturbance in the markets about one metal than the other.

Experience has shown that the price of American farm products at home is governed by the amount of legal-tender money in actual circulation. To satisfy ourselves of this fact we have only to examine the prices of farm products during a period of twenty years, beginning with the year 1872.

As to whether I am sound or not on this question, look at the action of our United States Senate—twice repeated in passing a free-coinage bill. The Senate is presumed to possess the best brain tissue of our government, although not always in accord with classic theories.

NEWTON L. BUNNELL.

THE ART OF LIVING TWO HUNDRED YEARS.

VERY few people, it is safe to say, desire old age. Men and women harassed by trouble, or overpowered by sorrow, surrounded by disgrace or tortured by pain may long for death, but not for a hundred or two hundred years of human life. Old age is of two kinds. One, the calm passing of many years; the other, brought about by excesses either mental or physical. The latter is not within the province of this brief essay. Without good health and faculties, trained by sobriety and temperance in all things, both of mind and body, long life would be an intolerable tedium. To die would indeed be great gain in such a case. The possibility of living two hundred years in average good health seems to many a wild sort of scientific dream. So did crossing the Atlantic by steamships; so did conveying intelligence by electricity; so did all the many startling inventions of these latter days. Every week we read of people who have lived to be a hundred or a hundred and ten years old. Let us not be surprised at anything.

We cannot defy death. But we may, by searching, find certain secrets of nature and apply them to the renewal of the organs whose decay is constantly going on in the body. Anatomical experiment and investigation show that the chief characteristics of old age are deposits of earthy matter of a gelatinous and fibrinous character in the human system. Carbonate and phosphate of lime, mixed with other salts of a calcareous nature, have been found to furnish the greater part of these earthy deposits. As observation shows, man begins in a gelatinous condition; he ends in an osseous or bony one—soft in infancy, hard in old age. By gradual change in the long space of years, the ossification comes on; but after middle life is passed, a more marked development of the ossific character takes place. Of course

these earthy deposits, which affect all the physical organs, naturally interfere with their functions. Partial ossification of the heart produces the imperfect circulation of the blood, which affects the aged. When the arteries are clogged with calcareous matter there is interference with the circulation upon which nutrition depends. Without nutrition there is no repair of the body. Hence in his work "The Physiology of Common Life," G. H. Lewes states that "If the repair were always identical with the waste, life would only then be terminated by accident, *never by old age.*" Both Bichat and Baillie considered that the greater number of people past sixty suffer more or less from arterial ossification, which brings about obstructions in the proper and healthy circulation of the blood.

None of these things interferes with nutrition and circulation in early years. The reparation of the physical system, as every one ought to know, depends on this fine balance. In fact, the whole change is merely a slow, steady accumulation of calcareous deposits in the system. The physical organs cannot preserve the balance between waste and nutrition. This is what we call old age. Nutrition in the earlier years of life is perfectly performed. Repairs are at once promptly attended to by the young blood. To repair the waste of the body, so that the exquisite equipoise called perfect health may be maintained, and the decay and blockage which advances with age may be kept at bay, is to prolong our years. If this secret be known, why not hundreds of years of life? Keep the means of repair of the system always in good working order, and you live, according to nature, in the highest, finest sense. Then, what are the means of checking these osseous and cartilaginous enemies of life?

The oxygen of the atmosphere is a most destructive element in many respects. Researches of a recent scientific character have shown that the origin of one of the sources of old age, namely, fibrinous and gelatinous matter, can be traced to the destructive action of atmospheric oxygen. Now, the relative proportions of oxygen and nitrogen in the air we constantly breathe are 22 of the former to 78 of the latter. Oxygen is the more active, aggressive element of the two, though of much smaller bulk. For every other element except fluorine, oxygen has an affinity, thus forming oxides. In the chemical changes constantly taking place in our bodies, oxygen plays the most important part by all odds. By oxidation, which is a constant waste or rust of life, the physical system is hourly destroyed, and then again built up by the reparation of the food we live upon. Albumen and fibrine exist in the blood, and are resolved into their component elements, carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen, sulphur, and phosphorus. By oxidation, the albumen is converted into fibrine, which nourishes the organs of our bodies. But in repairing their waste an excess of this substance accumulates in the blood vessels, causing their induration, and thus gradually lessening their calibre. Gelatine is an oxide of fibrine, as fibrine is an oxide of albumen. Oxidation causes these substances in part to be decomposed, and afterwards eliminated through the kidneys. A constant struggle is daily going on in our bodies when in the most perfect health between accumulation and elimination. And these accumulations, becoming greater in old age than the power of elimination, produce the effects we term feeling one's age.

In order to extend and prolong life, how shall they be counteracted? Let us see. Seventy per cent. of the human body is water—nearly three-fourths. Not a single tissue is there in which water is not found as an ingredient. Certain salts are held in solution by this water, portions of

which—notwithstanding the large quantity eliminated by the secretions—become more or less deposits in the body. When these become excessive and resist expulsion, they then cause the stiffness and dryness of old age. Entire blockage of the functions of the body is then a mere matter of time, and the refuse matter deposited by the blood, in its constant passage through the system, stops the delicate and exquisite machinery which we call life. This is death. It has been proved by analysis that human blood contains compounds of lime, magnesia, and iron. In the blood itself are thus contained the earth salts. In early life they are thrown off. Age has not power to do it.

Hence, as blood is produced by assimilation of the food we eat, to this food we must look for the earthy accumulations which in time block up the system and bring on old age. It is thus seen that in the necessary elements of nutrition lurk the enemies of life, for food contains salts of a calcareous character. Does it then follow that man, by careful selection of his daily food, may prolong his life? In a measure, yes. Bathing, pure air to live and sleep in, exercise and other means of preserving health, must be attended to, of course; but what we put into our mouths to make our blood is the important matter either in retaining health or prolonging life. Almost everything we eat contains more or less of these elements for destroying life by means of calcareous salts deposited by the all-nourishing blood. Careful selection, however, may enable us to avoid the worst of them.

Paradoxical as it may sound, certain foods which we put into our mouths to preserve our lives help at the same time to hurry us to the inevitable gate of the cemetery. Earth salts abound in the cereals, and bread itself, though seemingly the most innocent of edibles, greatly assists in the deposition of calcareous matter in our bodies. Nitrogenous food abounds in this element. Hence a diet made up of fruit principally is best for people advancing in years, for the reason that being deficient in nitrogen the ossific deposits so much to be dreaded are more likely to be suspended. Moderate eaters have in all cases a much better chance of long life than those addicted to excesses of the table. Blockages of the functions of the stomach are more usual to those who eat more than the stomach can utilize than to light eaters.

Mr. De Lacy Evans, who made many careful researches in these regions of science, comes to the conclusion that fruits, fish and poultry, and young mutton and veal contain less of the earthy salts than other articles of food, and are therefore best for people entering the vale of years. Beef and old mutton usually are overcharged with salts and should be avoided. If one desires to prolong life, therefore, it seems that moderate eating and a diet containing a minimum amount of earthy particles is most suitable to retard old age by preserving the system from functional blockages. Excessive action of atmospheric oxygen must be counteracted. Ossific matter deposited in the body must be dissolved as far as practicable. To produce this desired effect distilled water and diluted phosphoric acid are perhaps the most efficacious and the least harmless. Their combined chemical action retards old age.

The powerful solvent properties of distilled water are well known. As carbonate of lime exists in nearly all drinking water, the careful distillation eliminates this harmful element. As a beverage, distilled water is rapidly absorbed into the blood; it keeps soluble those salts already in the blood and facilitates their excretion, thus preventing their undue deposit. The

daily use of distilled water is, after middle life, one of the most important means of preventing secretions and the derangement of health. As to diluted phosphoric acid, it is one of the most powerful influences known to science for shielding the human system from the inconveniences of old age. Daily use of it mixed with distilled water helps to retard the approach of senility. By its affinity for oxygen the fibrinous and gelatinous deposits previously alluded to are checked, and their expulsion from the system hastened. Waste of the tissues is believed to be preventable also by the use of hypophosphites.

Hence, to sum up: The most rational modes of keeping physical decay or deterioration at bay, and thus retarding the approach of old age, are avoiding all foods rich in the earth salts, using much fruit, especially juicy, uncooked apples, and by taking *daily* two or three tumblerfuls of distilled water with about ten or fifteen drops of diluted phosphoric acid in each glassful.

As some objector may say, "I would not take all this minute and daily trouble to live 200 years—better a short life and a merry one." I will only answer, Take your choice.

WILLIAM KINNEAR.

INEBRIETY FROM A MEDICAL STANDPOINT.

PROMINENT among the grave social problems of to-day is the growth of the disease, Inebriety. Public interest in the subject has been shown for years by the many Temperance Reform organizations, and more recently by the formation of a political party whose primary idea is the suppression of intemperance by legislative enactment. It must be admitted that thus far these movements have been more or less failures. The reason for these failures is obvious. The inebriate has been regarded as an example of moral depravity, and the efforts to reform him have been in the line of appeals to his better nature. These waves of public sentiment served to produce an emotional crisis among inebriates. Names on pledge lists swelled to magnificent proportions. Hope waxed high, only to wane when it was found that the majority of these penitents had fallen into a worse condition than ever. This is the natural result of any method which appeals only to the emotional nature of the man, and fails to relieve his physical sufferings.

During the past few years the attention of the public has been drawn in another direction. Shrewd advertisers have assured the public that a panacea has been discovered almost equalling in potency the Elixir Vitæ. The inebriate was infused with new life and new aspirations, and he was assured that it would be impossible for him to recontract the habit.

Sufficient time has elapsed to allow us to judge of the merits and disadvantages of these systems. Many have been reformed indeed; but many not only have not been relieved, but have soon after taking the treatment become suicides or lunatics. Eleven cases reported by the *Medical Record* as inmates of one insane hospital, following this treatment, are too many to be explained by coincidence, or predisposition to insanity induced by alcohol.

Inebriates may be divided into three general classes.

1. The steady drinker, seldom or never becoming intoxicated.

2. The outgrowth of Class 1, associated with periods of intoxication. An effort to reform is made, but the physical deterioration so weakens the will that frequent excesses occur. These conditions become worse, and the

debauches more frequent and more prolonged. A general breaking down of the whole system follows, and the victim dies directly from chronic alcohol poisoning, or ends his days in a mad-house.

3. The true periodical or dipsomaniac forms a separate type, in which the law of heredity is strikingly illustrated. A study of family history usually reveals in the ancestry either chronic alcoholism or some grave form of nerve disease. A congenital weakness of the nervous system in the offspring results. Once the desire for alcohol or other narcotic becomes developed, the effect is overpowering.

The action of alcohol on the system is that of a narcotic poison, capable of producing death, with symptoms of brain congestion and coma so closely simulating apoplexy that there is hardly a hospital in the country which does not contain records of cases in which the correct diagnosis was made only on the post-mortem table.

The immediate effect of a moderate amount of alcohol is a feeling of increased vigor. Ideas are increased in quickness, but lose in concentration. The system soon demands the stimulant more frequently. Abstinence is followed by suffering. The hand loses its steadiness, the brain its clearness. Insomnia adds to the drain on nervous forces, and the patient instinctively resorts for relief to the poison which is the direct cause of his condition. In time these symptoms become intensified, and evidences of chronic degenerations manifest themselves. Scarcely an organ in the body is exempt. Alcohol in the stomach retards digestion by paralyzing terminal nerves and by a chemical action on the pepsin of the gastric juice, produces changes in the secretions of the liver, and vitiates the processes throughout the whole alimentary tract, by causing a perverted action of the sympathetic nervous system. Partially digested food passing from the stomach to the intestines becomes subjected to abnormal fermentations. As a result, poisonous products designated by modern chemists as ptomaines and leucomaines are formed. Elimination is retarded by alcohol; consequently these products are absorbed into the system and an auto-poisoning results. The lungs and skin undertake to assist in relieving the system of effete material, as shown by the peculiarly disagreeable odor of breath and perspiration persisting for days after cessation from the use of alcohol. These patients will be found to suffer from chronic catarrh of most of the mucous membranes, notably the stomach, and chronic liver and kidney changes leading to cirrhosis and Bright's Disease. Degeneration and resultant weakening of the walls of blood vessels predispose to rupture (usually in the brain), producing apoplexy.

A few words as to the reasons of failure in the so-called "Gold Cures" may not be amiss. The attempt has evidently been made to supplant by another narcotic action the narcotic effect of the alcohol to which the patient has been accustomed. By this substitution it was hoped that the craving for stimulants might be destroyed. Symptoms described by the subjects of two of the most prominent "Cures" are almost identical. The parched mouth and throat, impaired vision from dilatation of the pupil, confusion of ideas, loss of memory, with the depression and suffering of the first few days while under the full effect of the drugs, show plainly to the physician that the train of symptoms is due to the action of an alkaloid derived from one of the more powerful vegetable narcotics. The system most widely known in this country has received the unqualified condemnation of the Society for the Study of Inebriety in London.

The fatal mistakes in these cures have been of various natures. The first mistake is made by attempting to cure a chronic disease by the use of narcotic remedies and by the substitution method. The second is in putting a secret remedy into the hands of physicians who are ignorant of the formula they are using, and who are hired only because the law requires that the treatment shall be administered by a graduate in medicine.

The third mistake is in the indiscriminate selection of patients. Many apply for relief who are, in addition to inebriety, suffering from grave forms of organic disease. They are not fit subjects for such treatment until these troubles shall have received proper attention, except such cases as can receive appropriate treatment in addition to that suitable for the cure of the alcoholic disease. The number of patients becoming insane so soon after leaving these "Cures" is to be explained by this indiscriminate selection of cases. The writer has personally known of patients showing positive symptoms of general paresis who have applied for treatment for inebriety. To accept such cases is to invite disaster. In order to adopt a line of office treatment which shall be at all successful, it is necessary to bear in mind the fact that certain cases, if curable at all, are only so by prolonged residence in an institution under proper restrictions and in receipt of proper medical care. Under such conditions many otherwise hopeless cases may in time recover.

There remains a larger class, at most times capable of transacting business, and who, while unable to overcome the drink habit unassisted, seek aid to enable them to do so. The question arises: How shall we best treat them? Shall it be by the use of narcotics powerful enough to overbalance an intellect already on the border line of insanity? To answer is to condemn. This plan is illogical, and is undeserving the sanction of any honest medical man. An extensive experience with these cases has shown the writer that, if treated intelligently, on lines governing the physician in the treatment of chronic nervous troubles, satisfactory results may be obtained. The administration of remedies belonging to the tonic and restorative classes is, as a rule, promptly followed on the part of the patient by a voluntary cessation from the use of alcohol. The majority of cases will, if shown that the sudden withdrawal of stimulants does not produce the depression they dread, refrain from alcohol from the beginning of the treatment. With them, the improvement is almost immediate. Appetite is quickly restored, insomnia is replaced by restful sleep, tremor promptly disappears, in emaciated cases gain in weight is rapid, and general improvement in health goes on without interruption.

The writer contends that the physician who has the tact and patience to treat successfully chronic nervous diseases can treat inebriety successfully. The error is too frequently made (in practice, at least) of failing to recognize that we have here a real disease requiring both medicinal treatment and the use of those rarer mental and moral qualities on the part of the physician by which he inspires his patients with perfect confidence and trust.

E. F. ARNOLD, M. D.

SEP 21 192

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.

B. P. L. Cindery.
AUG 22 1911